

Ειρήνη, an Underlying Theme in Acts 10,34-43

This article attempts to determine as accurately as possible the meaning of εἰρήνη⁽¹⁾ in Acts 10,36 in the conviction that such a study gives a deeper insight into the part played by “peace” in Peter’s speech in Cornelius’ house and into how Luke generally uses the term in Luke-Acts. The contention is that “peace” underlies the whole speech and that its various meanings and nuances there nearly exhaust those given to the term elsewhere by Luke. The methodology followed will be composition criticism, a type of redaction criticism; for even if we cannot establish what sources Luke employed or how he did so, we can study his final composition in detail⁽²⁾.

I. “Peace” in the Context of Acts 10,36

Acts 10,36⁽³⁾ and its context tell us much about peace; in fact, for the only time in the NT, God is seen as the one who proclaims the good news of peace (cf. Luke 16,16; Rev 10,7). Surely, he does this through the agency of Jesus Christ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, who

(1) For recent studies on Luke’s concept of “peace”, see J.A. BOHUYTRÓN SOLANO, “¿En qué modo es significativo el término *paz* para el retrato lucano de Jesús?” (Extract of dissertation done at the Gregorian University; Rome 1996); J.J. KILGALLAN, “‘Peace’ in the Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles”, *Studia Missionaria* 38 (1989) 55-79. See also J. COMBLIN, “La paix dans la théologie de saint Luc”, *ALBO* III, 4 (1956) 439-460; W. FOERSTER, εἰρήνη, *TDNT* II, 400-402, 406-417; G. VON RAD, εἰρήνη, *TDNT* II, 402-406.

(2) For a discussion of Luke’s possible sources and redactional activity in Acts 10,1–11,18, see M. DIBELIUS, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* (FRLANT N.F. 42; Göttingen 1961) 96-107. F. BOVON, “Tradition et rédaction en Actes 10,1–11,18”, *TZ* 26 (1970) 42, views the speech as redactional, but also kerygmatic; it contains many traditional elements, perhaps, even including a traditional structure. K. HAACKER, “Dibelius und Cornelius: Ein Beispiel formgeschichtlicher Überlieferungskritik”, *BZ* 24 (1980) 234-251, criticizes Dibelius’ skepticism about this pericope’s being based on historical sources.

(3) For R.C. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation. Vol 2: The Acts of the Apostles* (Minneapolis 1994) 142, “What the speech as a whole affirms is succinctly stated in v. 36....”.

actually proclaims this peace⁽⁴⁾; and Χριστοῦ here is not only a name because it likewise reflects the messianic nature of this peace⁽⁵⁾. Elsewhere Luke also connects "peace" with Jesus as Christ or king or descendant of David (Luke 1,68-69.78-79; 2,11.14.26-29; 10,1-12; 19,38). However, to determine more accurately the meaning of "peace" in Acts 10,36, we need to consider the textual problem presented by v. 36 and how "peace" fits into its immediate context.

1. Textual Problem Presented by V. 36

Scholars have long recognized the textual difficulty presented by Acts 10,36⁽⁶⁾; and C. Lukasz considers the possible ways the verse could fit into the context⁽⁷⁾. It would be convenient to drop the reading [ὅν]; however, ὅν is the more difficult reading, and dropping it appears more "the easy way out" than the true solution. Nor, as it stands in the present text, does v. 36 appear to be an independent sentence; and although "He is Lord of all" is very likely parenthetical, that fact does not provide us with a grammatical solution to the function of the whole of v. 36. Lukasz' own solution, keeping the ὅν and understanding the verse as

(4) Since Peter is actually giving the speech and so proclaiming the good news of God's peace, logically we must also conclude that somehow God is acting through him.

(5) J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke (I-IX)* (AB 28A; Garden City, NY 1981) 225, observes that this verse reflects "peace" as the mark of the awaited messianic kingdom, derived from Isa 52,7.

(6) B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart 21994) 333-334, summarizes the textual problems with this verse and vv. 37-38. See also BOVON, "Tradition et rédaction", 39-40; J. DUPONT, "Dieu l'a oint d'Esprit Saint (Ac 10,34-38)", *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LD 118; Paris 1984) 323-324; G. STÄHLIN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; Göttingen 131970) 154. F. NEIRYNCK, "Acts 10,36a τὸν λόγον ὅν", *ETL* 60 (1984) 118-123, presents a history of the interpretation of the verse and opts for a close association with the preceding vv. 34-35. C. K. BARRETT, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1994) 497, 521-524, also discusses the textual problems of vv. 36-38.

(7) *Evangelizzazione e conflitto: Indagine sulla coerenza letteraria e tematica della pericope di Cornelio (Atti 10,1-11,18)* (Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII, 484; Frankfurt am Main 1993) 141. See also U. WILCKENS, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte. Form- und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen* (WMANT 5; Neukirchen 31974) 46-48.

dependent on καταλαμβάνομαι, has a certain appeal but assumes a full stop, i.e. a period, at the end of v.36 and introduces a break between that verse and v.37. His solution would somewhat separate vv.34-36 from the rest of the speech, but our consideration of the Christology and universality of vv.42b-43 will definitely suggest that this is not Luke's intention⁽⁸⁾.

Although the text of v.36 may be corrupt, vv.36-38 presently constitute one complete sentence. An obvious solution is to propose as reasonable an interpretation as possible for the text as it stands. If such an interpretation makes sense, conjectures to improve the text seem less necessary. The interpretation which remains loyal to our present text results in the following translation, "You know the message which he sent to the people of Israel, preaching the good news of peace through Jesus Christ — he is Lord of all, the message which spread throughout the whole of Judea, beginning from Galilee after the baptism which John preached, Jesus of Nazareth, how God...⁽⁹⁾".

Thus, τὸν λόγον of v.36 would be the object of the verb, οἴδατε (v.37) as would τὸ ... ῥῆμα of the same verse and Ἰησοῦν τὸν (ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ) of v.38. Naturally, these objects are similar in meaning. Furthermore, the puzzling nominative participle ἀρξάμενος is best taken adverbially⁽¹⁰⁾. Finally, the ὥς noun clause is also an object after οἴδατε⁽¹¹⁾ or in apposition to "Jesus of

⁽⁸⁾ See also G. LÜDEMANN, *Das frühe Christentum nach den Traditionen der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Kommentar* (Göttingen 1987) 134.

⁽⁹⁾ Such appears to be also the interpretation of the *NRSV:CE*; however, they place a period at the end of v.36. See also WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 48 and the discussion of G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte II: Kommentar zu Kap. 9,1–28,31* (Hrsg. A. WIKENHAUSER et al.) (HTKNT V/2; Freiburg 1982) 75-77. The English translations in this article follow *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments: NRSV:CE* (Nashville 1993). If that translation be judged incorrect, the translation is, then, my own.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Efforts to determine what this participle modifies are probably futile. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, 334, views it as a pendent nominative to be taken in a quasi-adverbial sense; parallels can be found only in Greek inscriptions and papyri and in Xenophon and Plutarch. One does not have to resort to an Aramaic idiom as does Torrey, but it is easy to see why scribes would have attempted to improve the grammar. For further discussion, BARRETT, *The Acts*, 523-524.

⁽¹¹⁾ M. ZERWICK – M. GROSVENOR, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Vol I, Gospels – Acts* (Rome 1974) 385.

Nazareth" which designation it would then begin to flesh out. In fact, λόγος in Acts regularly signifies the gospel message⁽¹²⁾; and Ἰησοῦς (e.g., Acts 9,20.22.23; 17,18; 18,25; 24,24) can do the same. True, in Acts ῥῆμα is generally in the plural and means the early preaching or a summary of the salvific events that God accomplished through Jesus⁽¹³⁾; but given its relationship to both "the word" and "Jesus", the singular in Acts 10,37 most reasonably has the same meaning as do they.

2. How "Peace" in Acts 10,36 Fits into Its Immediate Context

How then does "peace" fit into its immediate context? We have already pointed out that τὸν λόγον ("the word," v.36) is one of the objects of the verb, οἶδατε, in v.37 and so similar in meaning to τὸ ... ῥῆμα of v.37 and Ἰησοῦν τὸν (ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ) of v.38. However, since τὸν λόγον is placed first in its sentence, "the word" could also refer to what comes before it, namely, the ὅτι clause of vv.34b-35. "The word" would, then, also include the thought, "That God shows no partiality, but in every nation anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him (cf. Deut 10,17)". The strongest argument in favor of this interpretation is that the universality of the ὅτι clause in vv.34b-35 is matched by that in the parenthetical clause, "He is Lord of all". Probably, "Lord" in this clause refers to "Jesus Christ"; nevertheless, the concept of universality both precedes and follows "the word" and "peace" of v.36.

"The word" is further specified in v.36 itself by the phrase, εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. G. Schneider writes that the verb of this phrase could go back to Isa 61,1 (cf. Luke 4,18-19; Acts 10,38) while Luke would have taken the object, "peace" from Isa 52,7 (cf. 57,19)⁽¹⁴⁾. Should he be correct, we

⁽¹²⁾ See my *The Unity of Luke's Theology* (GNS 9; Wilmington, DE 1984) 90-92; cf. 86-94.

⁽¹³⁾ See E. REPO, *Der Begriff «Rhēma» in Biblisch-Griechischen II: «Rhēma» im Neuen Testament* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 88,1; Helsinki 1954) 38-58, who unfortunately puts too much emphasis on Luke's possible Semitic sources.

⁽¹⁴⁾ G. SCHNEIDER, *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte* (BBB 59; Bonn 1985) 275. If the assertion be true, it allows for a parallel between the themes of Acts 10,34-43 and those of Luke 4,14-44, e.g., the fulfillment of OT promises in Jesus, universality, messianic nature of Christianity, the

would have a further connection between Acts 10,36 and v.38. Surely, “the word” of v.36 is explained by the proclamation of the good news of peace. The participle εὐαγγελιζόμενος modifies God who is the subject of ἀπέστειλεν; God sends the word to the sons of Israel (τὸν λόγον [δὲν] ... τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ) and in so doing proclaims the good news of peace. The placement of διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ after εἰρήνην, instead of between it and εὐαγγελιζόμενος, shows that Luke wants to stress that peace is achieved through Jesus Christ and only indirectly that God proclaims the good news through him⁽¹⁵⁾. The parenthetical expression, “He is Lord of all”, which follows immediately after “Jesus Christ”, reveals that Jesus in some sense actualizes this peace and does not only proclaim it⁽¹⁶⁾. God proclaims and achieves this good news of universality, i.e., of peace, through Jesus Christ, who because of his actualizing it is designated, “Lord of all”. Thus, εἰρήνη in v.36, like “the word”, in part looks to God’s opened attitude toward everyone who fears him and does what is right. This universal understanding of “peace” in v.36 is confirmed by the confessional title given Jesus, “Lord of all” (cf. Rom 10,11-13)⁽¹⁷⁾.

3. Elsewhere “Peace” Expresses Universality (Luke 2,14.29; 12,51)

“Peace” as an expression of universality is found in three other Lucan passages⁽¹⁸⁾. In the Infancy Narrative, Luke 2,14.29 are of interest. At Jesus’ birth the angel reassures the shepherds with the

anointing of Jesus with power and the Holy Spirit, his salvific and miraculous activity, yet his rejection. Confer my “Does Luke Also Portray Jesus As the Christ in Luke 4,16-30?”, *Bib* 76 (1995) 498-522.

⁽¹⁵⁾ H. CONZELMANN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT 7; Tübingen 21972), 72, is not correct when he states that “through Jesus Christ” should be taken with “proclaiming the good news”. Rather, it goes with peace; “preaching the good news” modifies God, and Jesus is connected with it only indirectly. See E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia 1971) 352, n.3.

⁽¹⁶⁾ See Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden*, 156-157. Pace A. WEISER, “Tradition und lukanische Komposition in Apg 10,36-43”, *À cause de l'évangile* (FS. J. Dupont) (LD 123; Paris 1985) 762-763.

⁽¹⁷⁾ STÄHLIN, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 155, points to other confessional expressions in vv. 38, 40, 42.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Probably, Acts 7,26 should also be included here since there is an extensive parallel between Moses and Jesus in 7,17-44. The phrase, συνήλλασεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην, predicated in v.26 of Moses who is

good news of great joy for all the people⁽¹⁹⁾, “To you is born this day in the city of David a Savior who is the Christ (Messiah), the Lord” (Luke 2,11), and with the sign about how the child is clothed and where he is to be found. Then the angel is joined by many more who praise God and say, “Glory to God in the highest heaven and on earth peace among those whom he favors” (v. 14: ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας). The latter part of their praise surely has a universal ring⁽²⁰⁾; for it does not appear limited only to Jews; and as in Acts 10,36, the proclamation of peace relates to God’s stance toward all human beings⁽²¹⁾. True, in the Infancy Narrative, Luke writes of God’s favor while in Peter’s speech he speaks of God’s impartiality and acceptance of anyone who fears him and does justice. However, the similarity between the two passages is undeniable. Both passages in a context of universality speak of “peace” which comes from God and relates to Jesus identified as the Christ (Messiah). In Luke 2,29-32 Simeon, to whom it had been revealed that he would not die before he had seen the Lord’s Christ (Messiah), exclaims that God can now dismiss him according to his word “in peace”. The reason (ὅτι) why Simeon can say this is that he has seen God’s “salvation”, which stands in apposition to “a light” for the revelation to the Gentiles and to “a glory” for your people Israel. “Peace” is associated with Jesus as the Christ and with God’s salvific openness to both Jew and Gentile (cf. Acts 26,17-18.23); and we are reminded of how it is used in Acts 10,36. So, “peace” in both 2,10-14 and

trying to reconcile some quarreling Jews, reveals him as a type of Jesus’ activity in the passages under discussion. See my “The Parallels between Jesus and Moses”, *BTB* 20 (1990) esp. 25-26.

⁽¹⁹⁾ C. BURCHARD, “A Note on ‘PHMA’ in JosAs 17:1F.; Luke 2:15, 17; Acts 10:37”, *NT* 27 (1985) 290-294, argues well that Acts 10,36-37 have numerous and significant points of contact with Luke 2,10-19. However, as will be clear from this article, his understanding of “peace” in Luke 2,14 does not seem correct. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity: Vol. 2*, 138-141, contends that v. 36 is a summary of the angel’s announcement of Jesus’ birth to the shepherds in Luke 2 and that, if this is so, the whole of vv. 36-43 presents a summary of Luke’s Gospel in chronological order. On this last point, see also R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Hrsg. J. BLANK et al.) (EKK V/1; Zürich 1986) 343.

⁽²⁰⁾ See KILGALLEN, “Peace”, 66-68.

⁽²¹⁾ BOHUYTRÓN SOLANO, “¿En qué modo?”, 32-35, summarizes the reason why it is more probable that the reference is to God’s favor toward human beings.

vv.29-32 looks to God's salvation available to all whom he favors and is achieved through Jesus, the Christ.

Luke 12,51 reads, "Do you think that I have come to bring peace to the earth? No, I tell you, but rather division". In fact, Luke's reader already has more than ample reason to believe that Jesus did come to bring peace (Luke 1,79; 2,14.29; 7,50; 8,48; 10,5-6; cf. 19,38.42; 24,36). More importantly for our purposes "peace" in 12,51 stands in opposition to division, and in Acts 10,34-36.42-43 God shows no partiality and Jesus Christ is "Lord of all" and, as will be developed below, instructs his witnesses to proclaim that he is "judge of the living and the dead" and "everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name". So, according to Luke 12,51, "peace" stands in opposition to division; and in 2,10-14.29-32 it looks to God's salvation available to all whom he favors and is achieved through Jesus, the Christ; and the similar universal meaning for "peace" in Acts 10,36 comes close to the notion of the term in the Pauline school (Eph 2,14-18; cf. Rom 2,10-15; 14,17-20; Gal 6,15-16; Col 3,15)⁽²²⁾. Finally, this reflection about "peace" in Acts 10,36 helps us understand its use as an expression of farewell in 15,33 and 16,36. In 15,33 the church of Antioch bids a farewell of "peace" to the delegates of the church of Jerusalem from whom the former had requested a decision about how much of the Jewish traditions the Gentile Christians had to observe⁽²³⁾; a farewell of "peace" is likewise spoken by the Gentile jailor to Paul who converted him. In both cases, this final exchange of peace would well express the universal acceptance accomplished by Jesus for all Christians.

4. *Universality in Acts 10,34-36.42b-43*

Universality occurs likewise at the end of Acts 10,34-43; in fact, we find it at only the beginning and end of the speech⁽²⁴⁾; universality is lacking in vv.37-42a which could be addressed to

⁽²²⁾ See COMBLIN, "La paix", 444-446, who rightly also calls attention to Isa 57,19, εἰρήνην ἐπ' εἰρήνην τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἑγγύς οὖσιν· καὶ εἶπεν κύριος Ἰάσομαι αὐτούς (cf. Eph 2,13-17). Unfortunately, Comblin insists on giving "peace" in Luke a political meaning.

⁽²³⁾ Confer KILGALLEN, "Peace", 59-60.

⁽²⁴⁾ For example, see M. L. SOARDS, *The Speeches in Acts* (Louisville, KY 1994) 72-73.

only a Jewish audience. Above we reflected on the universality in vv. 34-36 and pointed out that "peace" in v. 36 also looks to God's opened attitude toward everyone who fears him and does what is right. At the end of the speech, Luke returns to this theme. In v. 42b we read, "He (Jesus) is the one ordained by God as judge of the living and the dead" and in v. 43, "Everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name⁽²⁵⁾". Consequently, at both the beginning and end of the speech, Peter refers to God's universal attitude and so to peace.

II. The Understanding of "Peace" in Acts 10,34-38

We have established the connection between "the word" and "peace" in Acts 10,36, particularly, in terms of universality. We likewise saw that τὸν λόγον (v. 36), ῥῆμα (v. 37), "Jesus (from Nazareth)" and the ὡς noun clause (v. 38) all depend on οἶδατε in v. 37. So, as the speech progresses, "the word" and "peace" take on various meanings and nuances. One might want to argue that "peace" really means the effects of salvation, rather than salvation itself. However, although peace in itself does express the effects of salvation, what we have seen thus far does not indicate that Luke held firmly to such a distinction. In this sense, I. H. Marshall is right when he understands "peace" in v. 36 to mean salvation in general and then goes on to speak of Peter's stressing this message of peace in the lifetime of Jesus⁽²⁶⁾. It is now easier to see how vv. 34-38 of the speech fit together. The "word" ("peace") or message, also designated "Jesus of Nazareth", is not only God's proclamation of his impartial openness to everyone who fears him and does justice or of Jesus' ability to forgive sins, but also a summary of the whole of Jesus' apostolic life⁽²⁷⁾: how God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power and how he went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil.

⁽²⁵⁾ SCHNEIDER, *Lukas, Theologe*, 263, 269, 276-279. See also WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 64-65.

⁽²⁶⁾ I. H. MARSHALL, *Acts* (Tyndale New Testament Commentaries; Grand Rapids 1989) 191-192.

⁽²⁷⁾ Interestingly, WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 69-70, contends that Luke in Acts 10,34-43 has shaped the missionary proclamation according to the scheme of the gospel *Gattung*. See also TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity: Vol 2*, 140.

This understanding of “peace” and “the word” in v.36 corresponds well with Jesus’ own words in the nearest parallel, “I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also; for I was sent for this purpose” (Καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην, Luke 4,43). E. Haenchen calls attention to Acts 13,26, “My brothers, you descendants of Abraham’s family, and others who fear God, to us the message of this salvation has been sent” (Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη)⁽²⁸⁾. Two other passages likewise prove helpful. Acts 10,33, “So now all of us are here in the presence of God to listen to all that the Lord has commanded you to say”, prepares the reader for the comprehensive nature of Peter’s speech; and 11,14 (cf. 10,22) contains a form of ῥῆμα and gives the angel’s summary of Peter’s speech, “He will give you a message by which you and your whole household will be saved (ὅς λαλήσει ῥήματα πρὸς σέ ἐν οἷς σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου). All four of these passages clarify that Peter’s speech addresses the whole of God’s salvific activity in Christ. Since “preaching the good news of peace” in Acts 10,36 explains “the word”, “peace” carries the same meanings and nuances⁽²⁹⁾ and this understanding is confirmed by a consideration of how Luke uses “peace” to mean the Christian message (10,5-6), Jesus’ doing good (19,42; Acts 9,31) and working miracles (Luke 8,48; 11,21; 19,38).

1. “Peace” in Luke 10,5-6

The mission of the Seventy(-two) is unique to Luke (10,1-12), although the concept of “peace” in these verses clearly comes from “Q” (cf. Matt 10,13). Luke 10,1-12 breaks down into the following sections: vv.1-4: introductory observations on the nature and difficulty of the mission; vv. 5-7: proclamation of peace to a private household and how the missionary should behave while there; vv.8-11: healing and proclamation of the nearness of God’s kingdom for a city and what to do when a city does not accept the

⁽²⁸⁾ *The Acts of the Apostles*, 351-352.

⁽²⁹⁾ See KILGALLEN, “Peace”, 58-59, who likewise holds for this meaning of peace in the verse and PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 342-343.

missionaries; v. 12: Jesus' concluding warning. "Peace" in vv. 5-6 is something that is said (πρῶτον λέγετε) and reminds us of the risen Christ's greeting of peace in 24,36. "Peace" in 10,6 also designates the quality of someone disposed to accept this announcement, yet Luke's further description of peace does not fit a verbal expression but rather something physical, "Will rest on that person" and "Will return to you". In vv. 5-6, then, "peace" is a proclamation, and Luke may so intend it in 24,36. Probably in the former passage Luke pictures it as something physical to show that it can be accepted or rejected. That peace in 10,5-6 indicates a proclamation finds support in the later words of the Seventy(-two), "The kingdom of God has come near to you" (v. 9; cf. v. 11). The pericope does report Jesus' directive, "cure the sick" (v. 9); but Luke has not related this miraculous activity directly to "peace". On the other hand, these two concepts are associated with one another in the parallel pericope, the mission of the Twelve, "And he sent them out to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal" (9,2). Consequently, the meaning of "peace" in 10,5-6 as proclamation favors our interpretation of "peace" in Acts 10,36 as also embracing the message about Jesus announced in vv. 37-38 and in the rest of the speech. The relationship between these passages is probably even closer since in the former pericope Luke writes of the Seventy(-two) and is surely thinking of the proclamation of the later Church, which would be about Jesus. So, the understanding and meaning of peace in Luke 10,1-12 should not be sought in what meaning Jesus would have assigned the word, but in what meaning the churches Luke knew would have given it. Finally, the mention of miraculous activity in Luke 9,2 and 10,9 reminds us that such activity is frequently associated with the proclamation of the message and at times with peace.

2. *Jesus Went about "Doing Good"*

Luke only once speaks of Jesus "doing good" (Acts 10,38); and it is the only time that εὐεργετέω appears in the NT. "Doing good" is really another Lucan way of speaking of salvation; however, given the contrast that Luke draws between the benefactors (εὐεργέται) of this world and Jesus' own attitude of service in Luke 22,24-27, "doing good" in Acts 10,38 likewise carries a nuance of service. To be sure, in his two volumes Luke does depict Jesus as doing good, and two such passages seemingly

speak of this activity as peace. When Jesus draws near to Jerusalem and weeps over it, he laments, "If you, even you, had only recognized on this day the things that make for peace" (Luke 19,42). The rest of the context (vv. 41-44) does speak of Jerusalem's enemies and their hemming in the city on every side and crushing her and her inhabitants and not leaving one stone upon another, and to an extent the peace Jesus is speaking about denotes the opposite of that happening. However, since the passage speaks of "this day" and defines Jesus' presence as "your visitation from God" (v. 44; cf. 1,68-69), "peace" in the pericope cannot signify only Jerusalem's freedom from being attacked by her enemies but must look to all the good that God through Jesus would have done for her and so would provide an example of how Luke can use "peace" to designate the good Jesus can do.

Acts 9,31 likewise appears to understand "peace" in the more general sense of doing good and to relate this activity to Jesus; it reads, "Meanwhile the church throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had peace, being built up and living in the fear of the Lord...". Grammatically, in this verse the church, not peace, is modified by "being built up and living"; however, these participles also partially explain why the church can be said to have peace. The question is to whom does "Lord" refer. Surely, it could be God the Father; but such a reference would not particularly distinguish these churches from the Jewish opponents in the previous verses. Besides, the previous pericope which reports the events that led up to the new situation in the church associates "Lord" with Jesus; for it speaks of how Paul saw the Lord, which must be a reference to Jesus, how in Damascus he had boldly proclaimed in Jesus' name and how later he had done the same thing as regards the "Lord" in Jerusalem. Since this second "Lord" repeats the idea of bold proclamation in Jesus' name and characterizes the Christian message, it must also look to Jesus. So, both earlier references to the "Lord" are to Jesus; and more likely the church's being built up and living in the fear of the Lord is a description of the good, the peace, that Jesus is achieving among her members. To be sure, Acts 9,31 reports post-resurrectional activity of Jesus and "peace" is partially explained by Paul's leaving Jerusalem and thus no longer annoying the Greek-speaking Jews by his bold preaching; but it would also include the peace, the good, that God is doing through Jesus for these churches. More generally, both passages would confirm that

“peace” could indicate the good Jesus can do and so embrace the thought of 10,38.

3. “Peace” in Luke 8,48; 11,21; 19,38

Luke associates “peace” with Jesus’ miraculous activity, and this association allows us to continue to see “peace” in the background of Acts 10,38. Moreover, A. Weiser rightly observes that Luke did not sharply distinguish between sickness and demonic possession; both were to be cured⁽³⁰⁾. Jesus says to the woman who had been suffering from hemorrhages for twelve years and who, after she had touched him, was immediately healed, “Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace” (Luke 8,48: *Θυγάτηρ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην*; cf. Mark 5,34). Surely, Luke 8,42b-48 portrays a connection between the miracle and the woman’s going in peace. Jesus worked the miracle and so “saved” the woman, and her faith created the occasion for this saving act. One could conclude that “peace” in v.48 then describes the spiritual and psychological condition in which the woman now finds herself. On the other hand, “peace” can only mean this, if it implies that salvation has already taken place in the change of her physical condition. “Peace” does look primarily to the final result of Jesus’ miracle but implies the whole saving act and thus supports our above contention that Luke views the peace of Acts 10,36 as inclusive of Jesus’ miraculous activity spoken of in v. 38.

At Jesus’ triumphal entry into Jerusalem, all the disciples loudly and joyfully praise God because of all his miracles and say of Jesus, “Blessed is the king who comes in the name of the Lord! Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest heaven” (Luke 19,38). Vv.37-38 connect Jesus’ miracles with his being king and with the joyful praise of God who works through him; and they connect this situation with “peace in heaven”. Surely, 19,38 parallels 2,14; but we have seen that “peace” in the latter passage is particularly linked to salvation and universality. In 19,38 it has something to do with miracles⁽³¹⁾; and this connection serves as further evidence that

⁽³⁰⁾ WEISER, “Tradition und lukanische Komposition”, 765, cites Luke 4,38-41; 6,18; 7,21; 13,11-17; Acts 5,16; 16,16-18; 19,12.

⁽³¹⁾ FOERSTER, *εἰρήνη*, 413, contends that v.38b should be understood in terms of earthly salvation. In part, this is correct; but it does not exhaust the meaning of the phrase, “Peace in heaven”; our point is that the text specifies the salvific experience of miracles in terms of peace.

“peace” in Acts 10,36 can reasonably embrace Jesus’ miraculous activity in v. 38.

Once we have established this connection between “peace” and Jesus’ miraculous activity, we are better prepared to analyze the term in Luke 11,21 (cf. vv.14-23), “When a strong man, fully armed, guards his castle, his property is at peace” (ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἔστιν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ). However, if someone stronger attacks him, he will take away his armor and divide the plunder. Most scholars see Jesus as the “stronger” one who conquers Satan; and according to the pericope, which is a discussion about how Jesus casts out demons, he does this by the finger of God, and the kingdom of God has come upon his audiences. Surely, “peace” in v.21 has a political or military sense: physical strength allows for the tranquil possession of one’s property. In the pericope Jesus, the stronger one, has overcome Satan; but this victory is no longer in a political or military arena but in a spiritual one. Nonetheless, logically the connection between being strong and having peace remains constant; and Jesus as the “stronger” who conquers Satan and casts out demons brings his own brand of peace. If this interpretation be correct, we would have yet another Lucan association of “peace” with Jesus’ miraculous activity and so additional support that the term in Acts 10,36 could carry this same nuance.

III. The Relation of “Peace” (v. 36) to Vv. 39-43

We have already pointed out that the theme of universality, designated as “peace”, occurs at both the beginning (vv.34-36) and end (vv.42b-43) of the speech. The unity of the speech and the importance of “the word” and so of “peace” are confirmed by v. 44 which reads, “While Peter was still speaking (Ἐτι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Πέτρου τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα), the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word (τὸν λόγον)”. Obviously, τὸν λόγον refers to the whole of Peter’s speech; but it also naturally refers back to τὸν λόγον in v. 36, which we have shown is explained by “preaching the good news of peace through Jesus Christ”. The phrase τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα of v. 44 likewise looks to Peter’s whole speech and relates to τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα καθ’ ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας of v. 37 which we argued above has much the same meaning as τὸν λόγον of v. 36. The fact that τὰ ῥήματα and τὸν λόγον of v. 44 refer to the whole speech and yet to τὸν λόγον of v. 36 and ῥῆμα of v. 37 proves to be a strong argument

that “peace”, in v. 36 also looks to the whole speech. Moreover, it demonstrates that τὸν λόγον (v. 36), ῥῆμα (v. 37) and Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ (v. 38) look not only to the contents of vv. 37-38 but also to vv. 39-43. However, at the end of Peter’s speech in Cornelius’ house, Luke introduces another element related to peace; for he writes of universality in terms of everyone who believes in Jesus receiving the forgiveness of sins which in Luke’s Gospel is associated with peace. This contention is supported by two Lucan passages.

1. “Peace” in Luke 1,79

At the end of the *Benedictus* (Luke 1,76-79), Zechariah speaks of John as the prophet of the Most High who will go before the Lord to prepare his ways, to give knowledge of salvation to his people by the forgiveness of their sins. This knowledge of God and forgiveness of sins will be achieved through the loving mercy of God because the dawn from on high (Jesus) will break upon them. The final verse, v. 79, with two infinitives of purpose, gives the scope of the dawn’s appearance⁽³²⁾. The verse begins with an image of light as salvation and describes those in need of it, “to give light to those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death” and then concludes with the salvific statement, “to guide our feet in the way of peace”. Jesus, identified in v. 69 as a mighty savior in the house of David, i.e., as Messiah, and portrayed as the dawn, is God’s instrument for achieving peace which in the context stands in opposition to darkness and the shadow of death and is explained by the “knowledge of salvation to his people by the forgiveness of their sins”.

2. “Peace” in Luke 7,50

In the last verses of the story of the sinful woman forgiven (7,47-50), Jesus proclaims that her sins are forgiven; in the previous verse he had explained to his host, the Pharisee, that this was possible because she loved much. Jesus’ parting words to the woman are, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace” (v. 50). Surely, the forgiveness of the woman’s sins relates to her love, but also can be described as her being saved through her faith in Jesus. This latter reality leads to her being at peace. “Peace” in this verse does not

(32) For a thorough study of the meaning of “peace” in Luke 1,79, see BOHUYTRÓN SOLANO, “¿En qué modo?”, 7-21, 55-56.

just mark the result of her sins being forgiven and thus saved; but rather embraces the whole of the experience. It is another Lucan expression for salvation⁽³³⁾ with its own specific nuance. Consequently, given the connection that Luke makes between the forgiveness of sins and “peace”, when he writes of universality and “the forgiveness of sins through Jesus’ name” at the end of Peter’s speech in Acts 10,34-43 both of these theological concepts reveal that Luke’s theme of “peace” is in the background.

Conclusion

“Peace” underlies the whole speech. It explain “the word” of v. 36 and so means God’s universal openness to those who fear him and do what is right. This universality is achieved through Jesus Christ who can thus be called, “Lord of all”, and appears again at the end of the speech (vv. 42b-43). “Peace” stands in opposition to division among human beings. Since it explains “the word” in v. 36, which corresponds in meaning to ῥῆμα, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ and the ὥς clause, “peace” likewise embraces the summary proclamation about Jesus, his doing good and his miraculous activity, found in vv. 37-38. However, Luke’s reader knows that there is more to come; for vv. 37-38 do not tell the whole story about Jesus. τὰ ῥήματα and τὸν λόγον of v. 44, which refer to the whole speech and to τὸν λόγον of v. 36 and to ῥῆμα of v. 37, direct our attention to the rest of the speech as a further development of “word”, and so of peace. For instance, at the end of the speech in addition to universality, we find the forgiveness of sins which Luke likewise associates with peace.

In Acts 10,34-43, “peace” carries most of the meanings and nuances attributed to it elsewhere by Luke⁽³⁴⁾. In addition to God’s universality (Luke 2,14.29-32; cf. 12,51; Acts 7,26; 15,33; 16,36), forgiveness of sins (Luke 1,76-79; 7,47-50), the message about Jesus (10,5-6; cf. 24,36), his doing good (19,42; cf. Acts 9,31) and miraculous activity (Luke 8,47-48; 19,38; cf. 11,21), peace in this speech is God’s salvific action (Acts 10,34-36; cf. Luke 1,68-79; 2,14.29-32), and messianic since it is achieved through Jesus (the

⁽³³⁾ See FOERSTER, εἰρήνη, 411.

⁽³⁴⁾ The only passages not considered are the few others which speak of a political peace (cf. Luke 14,32; Acts 12,20; 24,2).

Christ, who is thus "Lord of all". Finally, "peace" for Luke is not only a result of salvation, the spiritual and psychological state that follows on the reception or effect of God's salvific activity; but rather another expression for salvation like forgiveness of sins. For Luke, Christian "peace" does not exist without the nuance of salvation. However, the particular nuance of "peace" finds itself in the various effects that other expressions of salvation achieve in and for the human being, be this between the individual and God, among individuals as in the case of universality or in the given individuals themselves.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Rome

Robert F. O'TOOLE, SJ

Call to Be Perfect through Suffering (James 1,2-4). The Concept of Perfection in the Epistle of James and the Sermon on the Mount

This paper examines the concept of perfection in the Epistle of James with regard to the following: (1) The use and understanding of the notion of “perfection”⁽¹⁾. (2) The way in which this concept embraces the entire epistle and functions as a suitable introduction. (3) Finally, this investigation will show that this call to be perfect through suffering lies very close to the thoughts contained in the Sermon on the Mount as handed down in the Matthean community (Matt 5,2-12 and Matt 5,44-48).

I. The Horizon for Attaining Perfection in the Epistle of James

1. *Testing – Endurance – Perfection (Jas 1,2-8)*

The Epistle of James opens with a call to be joyful (v.2). By means of the catch-phrase (χαίρειν – χαράν) James passes from the opening greetings to the first introductory section of the epistle. The emphasis on joy gives a particular context to what follows: the readers of this letter are called to be happy when they encounter trials (πείρασμοι).

In the Epistle of James joy emerges as the proper response in situations where one's faith is tested. James goes on to state (v.3) that this testing (δοκίμιον)⁽²⁾ of faith leads to endurance. While δοκίμιον can have the twofold meaning of “genuineness”, or “means of testing”⁽³⁾, it is used here with the second meaning,

⁽¹⁾ The notion of perfection appears in the use of the adjective τέλειος (in Jas 1,4; 1,17; 1,25; 3,2) as well as the verbs τελέω (in Jas 2,8) and τελειόω (in Jas 2,22).

⁽²⁾ Some manuscripts read δόκιμον in place of δοκίμιον. The evidence of the manuscripts is largely in favor of δοκίμιον, and “the reading δόκιμον shows a tendency to regularize the unusual δοκίμιον, which occurs only here and in 1 Peter 1:7” (P.H. DAVIDS, *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [Exeter 1982] 68).

⁽³⁾ As M. DIBELIUS, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (trans. M.A. Williams) (Philadelphia 1975) 72-73, demonstrated. He argued

namely as a means of testing⁽⁴⁾. The epistle does not focus on the result, namely the genuineness of faith, but refers specifically to the way that faith is tested⁽⁵⁾, namely through the sufferings and trials that have been experienced⁽⁶⁾. The thought is very specific: sufferings and trials are a means of testing faith and this calls for endurance (ὕπομονή). In James the full significance of this word (ὕπομονή) appears from the background of the Jewish tradition. From the earliest days this tradition gave special attention to the testing of faith. Abraham (Gen 22) was the greatest example of a faith that was tested. Through his testing his ways proved faithful. On the other hand the Israelites were the outstanding example of unfaithfulness in time of trial as their wanderings through the desert demonstrated (Num 14,20-24).

But, it was chiefly the wisdom tradition that gave detailed attention to the relationship of suffering and testing⁽⁷⁾. During the period between the two testaments the question of suffering was intensely examined. In wrestling with this problem, examples were chosen from the past to show suffering's heroic nature, as well as its educative function:

a) In the book of Jubilees Abraham's faith was tested by ten trials: "This (is) the tenth trial with which Abraham was tried. And he was found faithful, controlled of spirit" (Jub 19,8).

b) In the Testament of Joseph, Joseph is referred to in much the same vein: "In ten testings he showed that I was approved, and

that it was in the first use, namely as genuineness, that it was used in 1 Pet 1,7. This accords with the way it is used in the LXX, for example, in 1 Chr 29,4 and Zech 11,13. 1 Peter uses δοκίμιον πίστεως in the sense of the genuineness of faith which is understood above all from the eschatological event of Jesus' revelation (R. HOPPE, *Der theologische Hintergrund des Jakobusbriefes* [Würzburg 1977] 23). Faith shows that it is genuine in the future as a result of its perseverance through suffering.

(4) In this sense it appears in the LXX text of Prov 27,21: "the furnace is a means of testing (δοκίμιον) for silver and gold".

(5) The distinction between the usage of δοκίμιον in James and Peter has been argued by a number of more recent interpreters such as DAVIDS, *Epistle of James*, 68; W. GRUNDMANN, "δόκιμος", *TDNT* II, 259 and HOPPE, *Der theologische Hintergrund*, 23.

(6) A close connection to this use is found in Origen, *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, 6 (DIBELIUS, *James*, 73): δοκίμιον οὖν καὶ ἐξεταστήριον τῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀγάπης νομιστέον ἡμῖν γεγονέναι τὸν ἐστηκότα πειρασμόν.

(7) Refer to Sir 2,1-6; 4,17-18; and Wis 2,17-19.

in all of them I persevered, because perseverance is a powerful medicine and endurance provides many good things (TJos 2,7).

c) The testament of Job also presents Job as an example of pious endurance: “He will bring on you many plagues, he will take away for himself your goods, he will carry off your children. But, if you are patient, I will make your name renowned in all generations of the earth till the consummation of the age” (TJob 4,5-6)⁽⁸⁾.

James refers both to Abraham (2,21) and to Job (5,11) as illustrations of those who demonstrated endurance in their lives. This steadfast endurance showed the educative value of suffering. The epistle is at home in this world of Jewish wisdom thought. True to this heritage it illustrates the steadfast endurance needed amidst trials and suffering. The person who has endured trials, who has shown heroism, is the one to be highly valued (just as gold which emerges from the furnace is greatly treasured). Trials and suffering have a positive value: they lead to steadfast endurance.

James’s thought proceeds step by step: trials lead to endurance (1,3); endurance in turn leads to perfection (1,4). While steadfast endurance (ὕπομονή) does occupy an important place in the development of this thought, it is not the climax. Rather, it functions as a link which leads to something even more important: perfection. Through testing one is led to patient endurance and then brought further to perfection.

The purpose of the whole development has led to this statement: “So that you may be mature and complete, lacking in nothing” (ἵνα ᾗτε τέλειοι καὶ ὁλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι) (1,4). This final clause is dependent upon the exhortation: “let endurance produce a perfect work” (ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω) (1,4). Again a string of catchwords has carried the line of thought along: the phrase ἔργον ἔχειν (“to produce a work”) corresponds to the verb κατεργάζεται (“it produces”, 1,3). This exhortation arouses the expectation that James would indicate some particular perfect work to be done. However, no particular perfect work is mentioned. Instead, he has in mind the idea of perfection itself. In effect he says: “You are that perfect work”⁽⁹⁾. This

⁽⁸⁾ See also TJob 27,3-7.

⁽⁹⁾ To support this interpretation DIBELIUS, *James*, 74, argues: “Only this interpretation is justified both by the correspondence between ‘perfect’ (τέλειοι v.4b) and ‘perfect work’ (ἔργον τέλειον v.4a) and by the schema of the concatenation; furthermore, it creates no linguistic difficulties”.

admonition calls the reader/hearer to perfection. James's view is not issued in a categorical statement: "Steadfast endurance makes you perfect". Instead, he issues a call: "Let endurance have its full effect".

In the Jewish wisdom tradition upon which James relies the quality of wisdom emerged as an essential aspect of perfection. "For even one who is perfect among human beings will be regarded as nothing without the wisdom that comes from you" (Wis 9,6). The same idea is evident in Jas 1,5: if one lacks the quality of wisdom, one is to ask God who alone can grant it. Wisdom ultimately emerges as the horizon for obtaining perfection. Wisdom is not an individual achievement acquired by one's own self realization, but it is a gift that comes from God, and is obtained through prayer. The Jewish wisdom traditions consistently emphasize this aspect: "All wisdom is from the Lord and with him it remains forever" (Sir 1,1)⁽¹⁰⁾. "Therefore I prayed, and understanding was given me; I called on God, and the spirit of wisdom came to me" (Wis 7,7)⁽¹¹⁾. James is dependent upon this basic Jewish wisdom tradition that sees God as the giver of all wisdom. God is the basis for the certainty that wisdom will be given to those who ask for it.

Having expressed the basic faith in God as the giver of wisdom, James turns to consider the human response. He advises one to pray in faith for what one needs (Jas 1,6). Here James reproduces an old Jewish wisdom tradition rich in its emphasis on prayer that is made in the certainty of faith: "Do not grow weary when you pray..." (Sir 7,10). This thought appears again in Jas 5,6: "The prayer of the righteous is powerful and effective".

The method of concatenation in Jas 1,2-8 guides the thought to the intended climax: a call to perfection. In effect he says: "Let steadfast endurance make you perfect"⁽¹²⁾. This pericope has shown that perfection is the hope of those who are steadfast. The

⁽¹⁰⁾ See also Sir 1,26; 17,11; 24,2; 39,6.

⁽¹¹⁾ See also Wis 7,15; 8,21; 9,4. Contrasted to the way God grants gifts, is the way a fool operates: "A fool's gift will profit you nothing, for he looks for recompense sevenfold. He gives little and upbraids much, he opens his mouth like a town crier. Today he lends and tomorrow he asks it back; such a one is hateful to God and humans" (Sir 20,14-15; cf. also Sir 18,15-18).

⁽¹²⁾ DIBELIUS, *James*, 74.

gift of wisdom is the necessary context for acquiring perfection. Above all one is to value with joy the fact that one can approach God and request from God this gift of wisdom.

2. Further references in James to enduring trials

a. Endurance under testing brings with it the “crown of life” (1,12-18)

Jas 1,12-18 continues the thought of the previous pericope. The concept of *πειρασμός* controls this short passage (appearing six times). The nature of the trial is now specified: it comes from within, rather than from without.

Once again the stress is placed upon steadfast endurance amidst trials. This endurance leads to eschatological life represented by the image of the “crown of life” (τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς). This formula is a fixed expression, occurring often in the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions⁽¹³⁾. The New Testament takes this over to emphasize the idea of life as an eschatological gift: 2 Tim 4,8 has “the crown of righteousness” (ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος), while 1 Pet 5,4 has “the crown of glory” (τῆς δόξης στέφανον). Viewed against this background James directs the macarism in v.12 in an eschatological way: whoever endures patiently in time of trial will receive the gift of life in the eschatological age.

God is not responsible for these trials. Instead, they come from within a person. God is the giver of “every generous act of giving, with every perfect gift” (1,17). What is the perfect gift that God can give? It is wisdom; the wisdom to know how to withstand the test. As in the opening argument, the same connections have been made: testing - endurance - perfection - wisdom.

⁽¹³⁾ HOPPE, *Der theologische Hintergrund*, 42. DIBELIUS, *James*, 88, also draws attention to its popular use. This appears from the following references. In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* reference is made in the Testament of Levi 8,2; 8,9 to the στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς while the Testament of Benjamin 4,1 speaks of conduct which will be rewarded with στέφανοι δόξης. 4 Macc 17,15 refers to the wreath of a martyr’s victory (“Piety won the victory and crowned her own contestants”), while the Ascension of Isaiah 11,40 speaks of the crowns of glory preserved in heaven.

b. Exhortation to patience (5,7-11)

Jas 5,7-11 forms part of the conclusion to the epistle⁽¹⁴⁾. James returns to a theme he considered twice in the opening of his epistle. This shows that the epistle both opens and closes with a reference to patient endurance under testing⁽¹⁵⁾. Here the emphasis lies upon “patience (μακροθυμέω) until the Lord comes (ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου)”. Two examples of patient endurance in the midst of suffering are given; namely, that of the prophets and of Job. Intertestamental literature gave much attention to the question of suffering and always gave concrete illustrations or examples of people who endured patiently under tribulations. One key example was that of Job (TJob 4,5-6). This shows James is aware of this tradition.

This pericope provides direction and perspective for the opening pericopae. Patient endurance amidst suffering occurs within the framework of the eschatological perspective of the coming of the Lord. This hope in the Lord’s coming gives significance and value to situations where sufferings and trials are experienced. The eschatological framework presents trials in their fullest context. Jas 1,2-8 presumes the importance of enduring steadfastly amidst trials; while Jas 1,12-18 stresses directly the eschatological dimension with the promise of “a crown of life” for all who endure through the trials. Finally, Jas 5,7-11 presents the eschatological age in more detail as the reward for patient endurance.

3. *Wisdom as the horizon for attaining perfection in the eschatological age*

The Jewish wisdom tradition clearly exercised an influence on James. But, in using this tradition, he has given it a stamp and direction of his own. As in Jewish wisdom literature, wisdom remains the horizon for attaining perfection (1,5). Because wisdom is God’s gift enabling one to stand the test, it is to be sought in prayer from God with firm confidence. Such prayer for wisdom in

⁽¹⁴⁾ For an outline of the structure of James see P.J. HARTIN, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* (Sheffield 1991) 23-34. The theme of eschatology predominates, as is the custom in the conclusion to many New Testament letters. For example, 1 Cor 16,22; 2 Pet 3,12-14; Jude 18-21.

⁽¹⁵⁾ A characteristic feature is to conclude a letter by taking up themes referred to previously.

faith becomes a clear illustration of the gospel tradition of “ask and it will be given you” (Matt 7,11).

The reason for joy (with which the epistle began) now becomes clear. Wisdom is God’s gift enabling the believer to attain steadfast endurance amidst trials and sufferings. As God’s gift wisdom is that all-embracing horizon influencing the present life and directing the believer toward the eschatological age. Wisdom enables believers to conduct their lives in the present world so that they will attain the perfection of the eschatological age.

II. τέλειος as a Guiding Framework for the Epistle

1. *What does James understand by “τέλειος”?*

The concept of “perfection” occurs in the epistle of James on several occasions. The adjective τέλειος occurs twice at 1,4; and once each at 1,17; 1,25 and 3,2. Two related verbs are also used: τελέω at 2,8 and τελειόω at 2,22. This is in fact more than any other New Testament writing.

Again the Jewish tradition out of which James operates provides the background for understanding this thought. In the Septuagint τέλειος usually translated the Hebrew מִמִּן, which indicates “unblemished, undivided, complete, whole”⁽¹⁶⁾. The concept expresses the giving of one’s heart to God unconditionally: above all it rejects idolatry or the worship of other gods. In Qumran the use of the word מִמִּן occurs quite frequently⁽¹⁷⁾. Above all it has in mind the path one follows in order to abide by the Torah. “To walk perfectly” would imply for the community of Qumran that they would carry out the fullness of the stipulations of the Torah and the laws of the community⁽¹⁸⁾.

For Jas 1,4 the meaning of τέλειος is that of fullness (“the perfect work”) or totality, which indicates maturity or completeness⁽¹⁹⁾ (“so that you may be perfect”). The same idea emerges

⁽¹⁶⁾ G. DELLING, “τέλειος”, *TDNT* VIII, 72.

⁽¹⁷⁾ DAVIDS, *Epistle of James*, 70, notes that in 1QS the word מִמִּן occurs eighteen times.

⁽¹⁸⁾ As DELLING, “τέλειος”, 73, says: “The contexts in which מִמִּן appears in the Qumran writings show clearly that the reference is to total fulfillment of God’s will, keeping all the rules of the community”.

⁽¹⁹⁾ The *NRSV* translates verse 4 as “so that you may be mature and complete, lacking in nothing”. “Mature” is the word for τέλειος.

from the use of τέλειος in Jas 3,2. At the heart of the paraenetical advice that James gives is James's "lament of the tongue" (3,2-5). James pointedly observes that "anyone who makes no mistakes with his tongue is perfect (τέλειος), able to keep the whole body in check with a bridle" (3,2). Here, again the notion of "perfect" is that of complete, whole, total in all that one does — one's actions produce a "total (perfect) work" that is not blemished or lacking in any way. The person who performs "the perfect work" shows a total dedication to carrying out God's will. Faced with trials and testing such a person is not deflected from total allegiance to God⁽²⁰⁾.

2. *A fitting introduction*

James's call to rejoice amidst trials and persecutions is a suitable introduction to the entire epistle. As a paraenetical writing it offers advice on how to lead one's life in the midst of changing situations. These situations (to which the epistle refers in graphic illustration) occur as different contexts of testing. All the instructions aim at leading the reader to attain the "crown of life", to attain perfection. They all demonstrate an eschatological direction that culminates in the conclusion: "Be patient, therefore, beloved, until the coming of the Lord" (5,7).

The opening (1,2-8) and the closing (5,7-11) provide the framework within which James's paraenetical advice is situated. This context gives meaning to these instructions by presenting *the goal* for which one is striving (perfection which is attained as the "crown of life"), as well as *the means* to that attainment — the gift of wisdom which comes down from above.

III. The Wisdom Theme of Perfection in James and in the Sermon on the Mount

1. *The call to perfection (Jas 1,4 and Matt 5,48)*

As has been indicated, the Epistle of James opened (1,4) with a call to patient endurance amid sufferings and testings. Such an

⁽²⁰⁾ As I have noted elsewhere (HARTIN, *James and the Q Sayings*, 205): "For James the meaning of τέλειος in 1:4 shows a twofold direction. First, it implies a total dedication to God, which is not undermined by trials and sufferings. Secondly, this total faith produces a style of life which is dedicated to a total action which demonstrates this allegiance".

endurance ultimately leads to a perfection that is only realizable through the gift of wisdom that comes from above. Life's goal is the attainment of perfection. James's paraenetical advice empowers the reader/hearer to accomplish this.

Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5–7) provides a perspective similar to that of James. For the Matthean community showing love for one's enemies and praying for those who persecute them was the way they would be "children of your Father in heaven" (ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς [Matt 5,45]). This establishes a direct connection to another beatitude that had been introduced by the Matthean community, namely "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God" (μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται [Matt 5,9])⁽²¹⁾. In the beatitudes the promise of being "children of God" is made to those who are peacemakers, while in the section on loving your enemies, the same promise is extended to those who pray for their persecutors. Loving one's enemies and praying for one's persecutors is a concrete way of striving for peace!

In Matthew and Luke this section of the Sermon climaxes in a very different way: Matt 5,48: "Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect". ("Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν). Luke 6,36: "Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful". (Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν).

In Luke the call "Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful" functions as a transition to the next part of the Sermon where mercy is specified by the action not of judging or condemning, but of forgiving (Luke 6,37). In Matthew, however, the saying "Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect" looks back over the Sermon and emphasizes that perfection is the goal for the life of a disciple who imitates God. For the Matthean Sermon this call to be perfect is a fitting culmination to the entire section. The context has already illustrated how God operates in relation to humanity ("for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous" [5,45]). God's goodness is bestowed upon all people irrespective of who they are or what they have done. This perfection is not a metaphysical understanding of the nature of God. Instead it is a description of God in terms of

(21) See HOPPE, *Der theologische Hintergrund*, 134.

action⁽²²⁾. God has an undivided love for all humanity and demonstrates this in action. By holding up the Father for imitation, Jesus calls on his followers not to limit themselves “with half measures in respect of human relationships”⁽²³⁾. Every action is to be imbued with a desire to show love, particularly toward those who are one’s enemies, particularly one’s persecutors. Perfection is demonstrated through the way one responds under persecution.

The idea of perfection occurs again in Matthew’s Gospel at 19,21 and one can observe a similar understanding at work. The inquiry of the rich young man provides the context: “What good deed must I do to have eternal life?” (Matt 19,16-22; Mark 10,17-31; Luke 18,18-30). Jesus responds: “If you wish to be perfect, go, sell your possessions and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me”. Matthew alone places a call to perfection in this context. Matthew’s Jesus calls upon the young man to give a total allegiance to God: there should not be anything that divides this allegiance. His great possessions act as a force that pulls him from this total allegiance to God. As Delling⁽²⁴⁾ says: “[To] be undivided in relation to God includes detaching oneself from that which separates from God”.

Both instances of the call to be perfect (namely, the Sermon on the Mount in Matt 5,48; and the rich young man in Matt 19,21) are consistent. The call is for a total, undivided allegiance to God. Radical demands are made on the life of the follower of Jesus. In Matthew 5,48 perfection demonstrates a total act of giving toward others: love of enemies knows no limits and even embraces persecutors. In Matthew 19,21 perfection entails giving up security in riches by embracing a total trust in God.

2. *Perfection as the goal of the Christian life*

Both Matthew and James present perfection as the goal of the Christian life. In both traditions the same understanding of perfection is evident. Three aspects are important in the use of the term “perfection” in James and Matthew:

(22) P.J. DU PLESSIS, *TEAEIOΣ: The idea of perfection in the New Testament* (Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor in de Godgeleerdheid; Kampen 1959), 171.

(23) DU PLESSIS, *TEAEIOΣ*, 170.

(24) DELLING, “τέλειος”, 74.

a) First, the basic understanding of “perfection” embraced a total dedication and allegiance to God that has resulted in a specific way of acting. For James it is a “total work”; for Matthew it is a total commitment that demonstrates love for God in actions.

b) Secondly, a connection was established between suffering and persecution. For James endurance through trials and persecution brought one to the virtue of perfection; for Matthew’s Sermon one is not deflected from this total commitment to God despite the persecutions experienced.

c) Finally, both traditions offer the promise of a reward to those who endure faithfully through suffering and persecution. James promises “the crown of life” (1,12) to those who endure. Matt 5,12 has a similar notion in the final beatitude: “Rejoice and be glad, for your reward will be great in heaven”. Not only is the promise made of a reward in the eschatological age, but the consequences of this promise call for joy in the present (Jas 1,2 χαράν; and Matt 5,12 χαίρετε).

3. *The law of love as the perfect law*

Both traditions of James and Matthew give importance to the demonstration of faith in action. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus challenges his followers in this way: “Let your light shine before others, so that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father in heaven” (Matt 5,16), and he goes on to speak about the necessity of fulfilling all the stipulations of the law (Matt 5,17-20). James expresses one of his major themes in this way: “But be doers of the word, and not merely hearers who deceive themselves” (Jas 1,22). In particular “the word” that they are to put into action is the law, which James characterizes as “the perfect law”. “But those who look into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and persevere, being not hearers who forget but doers who act — they will be blessed in their doing” (1,25). Elsewhere this law is also referred to as the “royal law” (2,8) and is identified as the “law of love”: “You do well if you really fulfill the royal law, according to the scripture, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself’” (2,8). This law of love is the all-embracing commandment and hence is called “the perfect law”. This identification of the law as the law of love is not unique to the Epistle of James; it is found in all streams of the tradition emanating from the person of Jesus. Appearing

many times in the Synoptic Gospels, it is also evident in the Pauline tradition (Rom 13,9) and forms the very essence of Johannine theology. Here James is at home in the centre of the Jesus tradition.

Both the traditions of James and Matthew require a perfect fulfillment of the law. "For, whoever keeps the whole law but fails in one point has become accountable for all of it" (Jas 2,10). Similarly, in Matt 5,18 Jesus says: "For truly I tell you until heaven and earth pass, not one letter, not one stroke of the letter, will pass from the law until all is accomplished". The thought is the same: the whole law is to be carried out in every respect. In fact both traditions present the fulfillment of the law as the path toward perfection. This lies within the orbit of the Jewish wisdom tradition where the themes of wisdom, law and perfection all converge together⁽²⁵⁾. For this tradition perfection comes through carrying out the laws inspired by wisdom. The theological horizon of the traditions of wisdom, James and Matthew blend together in a perception of the fulfillment of law as the path to perfection. James

(²⁵) In Ps 19,7 wisdom, law and perfection all unite in one breath: "The law of the Lord is perfect, reviving the soul; the decrees of the Lord are sure, making wise the simple". Because the law comes from God, it is perfect and its observance leads to wisdom.

Wis 6,17-20 presents a vision that wisdom is only attained through the observance of laws: "The beginning of wisdom is the most sincere desire for instruction, and concern for instruction is love of her, and love of her is the keeping of her laws, and giving heed to her laws is assurance of immortality and immortality brings one near to God; so the desire for wisdom leads to a kingdom". In this context wisdom is personified and stands before God. She gives herself as a gift to those who love and seek her. One shows a desire for wisdom by keeping her laws. This observance brings one closer to God and the attainment of wisdom. Through this wisdom comes the inheritance of a kingdom. Such an expression in James as νόμος βασιλικός is understandable, for it would refer to that law which leads to wisdom and the inheritance of a kingdom. Hence it is a kingly law. Elsewhere in the Book of Wisdom the same approach is emphasized. In Wis 9,5-10 the task of wisdom is to help one to decide on what laws to perform and how to perform them. Without wisdom "I am ... a man ... with little understanding of judgment and laws..." (Wis 9,5).

In a similar way Sir 6,23-31 speaks of the observance of laws which grant wisdom. The reward is "a splendid crown" (in the LXX it is a "crown of gladness"). The reward appears in regal terms, which again comes close to James' νόμος βασιλικός.

developed these traditions by identifying the law as the law of love and James argues that it is in the fulfillment of the law of love, the true law of liberty, that perfection is attained.

4. *The ethical lifestyle of the one seeking perfection*

a. Wisdom as the context

For both traditions, James and Matthew, the gift of wisdom is the greatest of God's gifts. In Matt 11,25-27 all wisdom originates in God and is communicated to Jesus who in turn gives it to whomsoever he wishes. It is opposed to those on earth who set themselves up as the wise ("because you have hidden these things from the wise", [ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν]). By a free choice of the Son the gift of wisdom is made to those who are "infants" (νήπιοι): they are the ones for whom God has shown a special care. They will be truly wise because they have been chosen by God as the bearers of God's revelation. The wise of this world are rejected for they place their reliance upon themselves and their own efforts. Instead, it is to the νήπιοι that Jesus communicates true wisdom for they are the ones who show dependence upon God.

The choice of the νήπιοι according to human standards corresponds to God's choice of the poor — a common biblical theme and one that James echoes: "Listen, my beloved brothers and sisters. Has not God chosen the poor in the world to be rich in faith and to be heirs of the kingdom that he has promised to those who love him?" (Jas 2,5). In this sense the poor belong to that group of people who are despised by the world (just as the νήπιοι are despised by the world). To the poor (πτωχοί) James makes the promise of the kingdom (as do Matthew and Luke in the beatitudes).

The previous saying (Matt 11,25-27) had cast Jesus as wisdom's envoy charged with communicating wisdom to others. Now Jesus speaks in the manner of wisdom herself: "Come to me, all you that are weary and are carrying heavy burdens, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me; for I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light" (Matt 11,28-30). This saying is steeped in the wisdom tradition reflecting especially Sir 51,26-27⁽²⁶⁾.

⁽²⁶⁾ Sir 51,26-27 reads: "Put your neck under her (wisdom's) yoke, and let your souls receive instruction; it is to be found close by. See with your own eyes that I have laboured but little and found for myself much serenity".

In Sirach wisdom is speaking, while in Matthew Jesus is speaking, adopting the manner and style of Wisdom incarnate.

The Epistle of James also presents wisdom as a gift that comes down from above (3,13-18). "But, the wisdom from above is first pure,..." (3,17). This gift of wisdom should be the inspiration behind the performance of every good action. "Who is wise and understanding among you? Show by your good life that your works are done with gentleness (πραῦτητι) born of wisdom" (Jas 3,13). Here the readers are called upon to illustrate meekness (πραῦς) in their way of life: meekness is a virtue inspired by the wisdom from above. Just as Jesus is the truly meek person who calls his followers to meekness (Matt 11,28-30), so the disciple is called upon to illustrate meekness throughout life as a consequence of the gift of wisdom from above (Jas 3,17-18). Both traditions demonstrate an association between wisdom and meekness⁽²⁷⁾.

b. The ethical consequences of the gift of wisdom

As has been argued, the entire Epistle of James offers the reader advice on how to lead a specific way of life. In addition to emphasizing that true wisdom comes down from above, James demonstrates that this gift of wisdom has certain ethical consequences for the way of life of the receiver. "But the wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, willing to yield, full of mercy and good fruits, without a trace of partiality or hypocrisy. And a harvest of righteousness is sown in peace for those who make peace" (3,17-18).

Four of the virtues emphasized in Jas 3,17-18 also occur in the beatitudes of Matthew's Gospel (namely pure, peaceable, gentle and

⁽²⁷⁾ Meekness (πραῦς) is not a common word within the New Testament. It is found in the Gospels only on three occasions, all of them in material found only in Matthew's Gospel (5,5; 11,29; 21,5). In the Epistle of James it occurs on two occasions (1,21; 3,13). In the latter reference in James the disciple is called upon to show signs of being 'meek' (3,13 πραῦς) in life; meekness is a virtue which is inspired by wisdom from above. In Matthew Jesus as Wisdom Incarnate is the truly meek person who calls upon his followers to imitate his meekness. In both traditions one observes a connection between meekness and wisdom.

full of mercy)⁽²⁸⁾. While the vocabulary differs, the same thought underlies each tradition. Matthew's beatitudes place emphasis on the values and virtues a follower of Jesus should adopt in order to inherit the kingdom and become a "child of God". James places emphasis on the fact that these are the virtues and values that will be exercised by the one who has received the gift of wisdom from above. Both traditions emphasize the same ethical way of life. The Christian way of life aims at perfection, but it can only be achieved through God's help, through the communication of God's wisdom.

The essence of this teaching lies in acknowledging total dependence upon God. Perfection, which has been shown to consist in a total commitment to God, is acquired only through God's gift of wisdom. One must acknowledge the origin of this source of wisdom in God by placing complete dependence upon God. "Draw near to God and he will draw near to you... Humble yourselves before the Lord, and he will exalt you" (Jas 4,8-10). Once again the background is the wisdom tradition: "Those who fear the Lord prepare their hearts, and humble themselves before him" (Sir 2,17).

The practical wisdom teaching evident in James and Matthew centres upon the conviction that faith has to be illustrated by actions. James demonstrates that faith has to be imbued with the wisdom from above if it is to be expressed correctly in action. Only through action does one demonstrate a faith that is perfect. "You see that faith was active along with his works, and faith was brought to completion by the works" (Jas 2,22). Wisdom holds faith and action together and produces a faith that saves (2,14). A life of faith that illustrates itself in action finds its goal in perfection. The teaching of James and the Sermon on the Mount converge here. The Sermon is a design for life led under the rule of God: it shows faith expressed in action. Both James and the Sermon agree: faith must demonstrate itself in action. "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord', will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does

| (28) | Matthean Beatitudes | Jas 3,17-18 |
|-------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Meek | μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς... | ἐπιεικής... |
| Merciful | μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες... | ἐλέους... |
| Pure | μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ καρδίᾳ... | ἀγνή... |
| Peacemakers | μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί... | εἰρηνική ... ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην. |

the will of my Father in heaven” (Matt 7,21), while Jas 2,18 states: “But someone will say, ‘You have faith and I have works’. Show me your faith apart from your works, and I by my works will show you my faith”.

The traditions to which James and Matthew bear witness converge here: it is not the profession of faith in God that is all-important — rather it is the expression of this faith by means of a lifestyle led in conformity with God’s will. The central perspective of all wisdom teaching is evident in both James and the Matthean traditions: all wisdom advice promotes a lifestyle that aims at perfection.

Gonzaga University
Religious Studies Department, AD Box 57
Spokane, WA 99258-0001 USA

Patrick J. HARTIN

Variations in Biblical Hebrew

Because it was subject to a long process of composition and editing over successive generations, the Hebrew Bible inevitably exhibits variations in its language. The parallel accounts in Chronicles and Samuel Kings provide a wealth of examples⁽¹⁾. The grammar and lexicon of Early Hebrew Poetry⁽²⁾ exhibit notable differences from Classical Hebrew. Some variations reflect the linguistic conventions of a given period in the history of Hebrew⁽³⁾. Apart from these, there are also regional varieties of Hebrew. Thus, whereas the Hebrew of the Bible generally reflects Judahite or Jerusalem Hebrew, a number of passages still preserve traits of Northern Hebrew⁽⁴⁾ or Transjordanian dialects⁽⁵⁾.

(1) One will notice the Chronicler's tendency to use more *matres lectionis*; to replace older forms like ממלכה 'kingdom' by ממלכות; to eliminate archaic particles like אֲךְ 'surely' and וַיֵּן 'please'; see A. KROPAT, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen* (Giessen 1909) and more recently R. POLZIN, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (HSM 12; Missoula 1976).

(2) This corpus includes Gen 49, Exod 15; Balaam's Oracles in Num 22-24; Deut 32; 33; Judg 5; 1 Sam 2; 2 Sam 1; 22 (= Ps 18); 23; Ps 68; Hab 3. The most important distinctive traits are conveniently listed in A. SAENZ-BADILLOS, *Historia de la lengua hebrea* (Sabadell 1988) 65-70; Engl. transl. with improvements on the original *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge 1993) 56-62 and the vast bibliography cited there; add however, for questions concerning method of dating, D.A. ROBERTSON, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (SBLDS 3; Cambridge, MA 1966).

(3) N.M. WALDMAN, *The Recent Study of Hebrew: A Survey of the Literature with Selected Bibliography* (Winona Lake 1989) 44-47.

(4) For example 1 Kgs 17-2 Kgs 10; Qohelet, Pss 9-10; 16; 29; 36; 45 (and other Korah Psalms 42-49; 84-85; 87-88); 50; 53; 58; 74 (and other Asaph Psalms 50; 73-83); 116; 132; 133; 140; 141; Neh 9. The most important discussions on this topic are C.F. BURNEY, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings* (Oxford 1903) 208-209 (see the re-interpretation of the data in I. YOUNG, "The 'Northernisms' of the Israelite Narratives in Kings", *ZAH* 8 [1995] 63-70); J.R. DAVILA, "Qohelet and Northern Hebrew", *Maarav* 5-6 (1990) 69-87; D.C. FREDERICKS, *Qoheleth's Language: Re-evaluating its Nature and Date* (Lewiston 1988); G.A. RENDSBURG, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Evidence of Selected Psalms* (SBLMS 43; Atlanta 1990); id., "The Northern Origin of 'The Last Words of David' (2 Sam 23,1-7)", *Bib* 69 (1988) 113-121; id., "Additional Notes on 'The Last Words of David' (2 Sam 23,1-7)", *Bib* 70 (1989) 403-408; id., "The Northern Origin of Nehemiah 9", *Bib* 72 (1991) 348-366.

(5) For example, the Elihu speeches in Job 32-37; Prov 30-31; Isa

Studies in Hebrew and other North-West Semitic languages have until recently concentrated on historical or regional dialects⁽⁶⁾. This essay will explore the social and stylistic aspects of such dialects, with an emphasis on the relevance to biblical interpretation. Normally dialectological research relies heavily on data collected directly from native speakers in controlled field-work. This procedure is impossible for the study of ancient languages known only from written sources, as is the case with Biblical Hebrew. Consequently our knowledge of the variations in Hebrew is conditioned by the special traits that are handed down to us in the Hebrew Bible. This can be a serious drawback if our main purpose is to map out the historical realities of the dialects. But the situation is different if our main concern is a better understanding of biblical literature itself.

I. Sociolinguistic Orientations in Dialectology

Progress in Syro-Palestinian dialectology and sociolinguistics may provide a good background for further discussion about variations in Hebrew. As is generally known, early in the first millennium BC, Hebrew, Phoenician, Aramaic and Transjordanian dialects were in close contact with each other. Research in these dialects tends to describe the development of linguistic traits that differentiate one language from the other. Little attention has been given to the contact situation which produced convergent innovations. Such innovations generally start as a process that spreads from one focal area in a language to its marginal area and to other languages in the adjacent areas. The focal area is the region in which alternate forms

2,11-12; and Balaam's Oracles in Num 22-24; see S. A. KAUFMAN, "The Classification of the North West Semitic Dialects of the Biblical Period and Some Implications Thereof", *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Panel Sessions: Hebrew and Aramaic Languages (Jerusalem 1988) 41-57.

⁽⁶⁾ Z. S. HARRIS, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (AOS 16; New Haven 1939). F. M. CROSS-D. N. FREEDMAN, *Early Hebrew Orthography* (AOS 36; New Haven 1952). W. R. GARR, *Dialect Geography of Syria-Pal-estine 1000-586 B.C.E.* (Philadelphia 1985).

and other changes occur for the first time. The new forms will later, gradually or suddenly, spread to other areas which are called marginal areas. Sometimes the change affects more than one dialect or language⁽⁷⁾. The development of *wayyiqtol* in North-West Semitic during the early centuries of the first millennium BC is a case in point. This form first developed in Hebrew⁽⁸⁾ and spread to the adjacent Aramaic and Canaanite-speaking regions, i.e., to the Deir 'Alla Transjordanian dialect in the south-east⁽⁹⁾, to the Moabite dialect in the east⁽¹⁰⁾, to the Aramaic of Hamath in the north⁽¹¹⁾, and to the recently discovered Aramaic stele of Tel Dan⁽¹²⁾ in the north. There is not sufficient evidence to establish the spread of *wayyiqtol* to the north-west region where Phoenician was

(7) For recent dialectological views on such a process, see H. H. HOCK, *Principles of Historical Linguistics* (Berlin–New York 1991) 440–455, J. K. CHAMBERS–P. TRUDGILL, *Dialectology* (Cambridge 1981) 125–142.

(8) The verbal form was already in use by the Jerusalem officials by the end of 8th century, judging from its occurrence in the Siloam inscription; see *KAI* 189,4(–5) *wylkw* (*hmym*) 'and (the water) flowed'. Although this is the earliest epigraphic evidence, *wayyiqtol* must have already been in use for some time. The form gradually fell into disuse during the 6th century.

(9) Deir 'Alla I,1 *wy'tw* 'and they came'; I,2 *wy'mrw* 'and they said'; I,3 *wyqm* 'and he arose'. For further observations, see G. A. RENDSBURG, "The Dialect of the Deir 'Alla Inscription", *BO* 50 (1993) 309–328.

(10) *KAI* 181,3.9 *w's* 'and I made'; 10 *wybn* 'and he built'; 11 *w'hrq* 'and I slew'.

(11) *KAI* 202 A,11 *w's ydy* 'and I raised my hands'; A,11 *wy'ny* 'and he answered me'.

(12) Tel Dan A,3 *wyškb* 'and he lay down'; B,3 *wy'l* 'and he entered'; A,5 *wyhk* 'and he went'; A,6 *w'qtl* 'and I slew'; A,9 *w'sm* 'and I put'. See the editio princeps by A. BIRAN–J. NAVEH, "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan", *IEJ* 43 (1993) 81–98; id., "The Tell Dan Inscription: A New Fragment", *IEJ* (1995) 1–18. The editors actually denied the existence of conversive *waw* here. This view is also shared by T. MURAOKA, "Linguistic Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan", *IEJ* (1995) 19–21. For the interpretation that the *wyqtl* form corresponds functionally to Hebrew *wayyiqtol* see J. TROPPER, "Zur Steleninschrift aus Dan", *UF* (1994) 487–492. He also believes that the preterital sense of *wyqtl* is genuinely Aramaic and not under Canaanite, hence Hebrew, influence. But in other Aramaic regions where contact with Hebrew was absent no such form occurs. This will make the claim hard to substantiate. A contact-induced innovation is more likely.

spoken⁽¹³⁾. The appearance of the form in these dialects can be interpreted as a result of contact with Hebrew. It will be observed that *wayyiqtol* does not occur in the regions of Aramaic that are not directly in contact with Hebrew, such as the eastern region, i.e., Fekheriyye, or in the north-western one, i.e., Bar-Rakkub, Sfire, Samal⁽¹⁴⁾. The sphere of influence of the Hebrew Kingdoms, extending as it did to the adjacent nations, was favorable to the spread of *wayyiqtol* (and other features not discussed here) to their dialects or languages.

For its part, Hebrew has also borrowed elements from neighboring languages and integrated them in its system. The Northern and Transjordanian elements mentioned at the beginning of this essay reflect this process. The adoption of foreign elements by Hebrew was motivated by the effort to give more vividness to literary composition by imitating the speech of foreigners⁽¹⁵⁾. Viewed from a historical-comparative perspective, there was thus a mutual borrowing leading to a process of convergence among different dialects in areas where these dialects were in contact with each other.

The process of convergence and borrowing illustrated above reveals that the underlying factors of language change are the speakers themselves, in this case, speakers of Classical Hebrew and especially their literati, rather than historical or regional ties of the languages. During the last three decades there has been a growing interest to study language variations from a sociolinguistic viewpoint. Variations are explained not only by tracing their historical or regional origins but also by showing their correlations to the social status of the speaker and the circumstances in which the variations occur⁽¹⁶⁾.

⁽¹³⁾ GARR, *Dialect Geography*, 184.

⁽¹⁴⁾ GARR, *Dialect Geography*, 185 thinks that the form in Panammu/KAI 215,5 *withrgw* could mean 'and you (pl.) killed', hence a candidate for *wayyiqtol*. But he also notes that the context is unclear. A recent study by J. TROPPER, *Die Inschriften von Zincirli* (Münster 1993) 108, 236 excludes this possibility.

⁽¹⁵⁾ G. R. RENDSBURG, "Linguistic Variation and the 'Foreign' Factor in the Hebrew Bible", *IOS* 15 (1995) 188-190; YOUNG, "The 'Northernism'", 65.

⁽¹⁶⁾ CHAMBERS-TRUDGILL, *Dialectology*, 54-100; HOCK, *Principles*, 426-432.

Variants that agree with the social status of the speakers and their awareness of the significance of such variants are called *social markers*⁽¹⁷⁾. The classic statement about social markers is found in William Labov's finding on the distribution of the two basic realizations of the phoneme /r/ as an audible sound [r] and as an inaudible [ø] among the population of New York City⁽¹⁸⁾. He was the first to investigate in a systematic way the correlation between linguistic variety and the speaker's social class. Rather unexpectedly, the audible [r] turns out to be the pronunciation found among people of the upper middle class. This [r] is less audible among people of the working class. At the same time the study also reveals that the working class has a tendency to imitate the pronunciation of the upper middle class by pronouncing the [r] clearly. Hence in New York City the audible [r] is a social marker that identifies the upper middle class people and those who wish to be associated with them. Labov's study also shows that prestige is an important factor effecting language change. In the 30's the [r] was hardly pronounced among the population regardless of social class. In the 50's and 60's the adoption of [r] became more widespread as described above. The situation during the last two decades shows an overwhelming tendency to pronounce [r].

There are some variations which cannot be taken as social markers since they do not strictly correlate to the social identification of the speakers, factual or imagined, hence the user, but rather to various social circumstances or use of such variants.

(17) Social markers are not the same as social indicators. Social indicators show variations correlating to social classes in any context of speech. Social markers are more highly developed indicators in that the variations depend both on social classes and on level of attention paid to speech — hence awareness of the significance of the variations — whatever the motivation may be. Also see CHAMBERS-TRUDGILL, *Dialectology*, 82-88.

(18) W. LABOV, *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (Washington, DC 1966). He bases his data, among other things, on the varying pronunciation of /r/ in *fourth floor* by different department store attendants when answering the casual question "Excuse me, where are the women's shoes?" For a lucid textbook summary of Labov's method of survey, see R.A. HUDSON, *Sociolinguistics* (Cambridge 1980) 148-152. This method has been tested and refined by other scholars; the basic insights, however, are still valid; see A.M.S. MCMAHON, *Understanding Language Change* (Cambridge 1994) 232-252.

These variations belong to what is called *register*. This is illustrated by another important finding in Labov's study. The pronunciation of /r/ as audible [r] is heard in formal speech regardless of one's social background. In casual speech this [r] sound tends to disappear. Consequently, the audible [r], which proves to be a social marker, is also part of the formal register⁽¹⁹⁾. But it should be noted that not all social markers are also registers and vice versa.

II. Relevance for Biblical Interpretation

The sociolinguistic orientation outlined above can be useful to the interpretation of some passages in the Hebrew Bible. The following discussion will focus on the social markers and registers that have some relevance to biblical exegesis.

1. *Some Social Markers*

The forms and range of social markers in Biblical Hebrew still await systematic investigation. At this point, however, one can make some statements about group awareness, social status, and religious preferences in Ancient Israel as reflected in the language. In this connection it is useful to remember that any dialectological study of social markers in Biblical Hebrew will reveal something about the social world as depicted in the Hebrew Bible itself rather than the historical realities in Ancient Israel. This will therefore be different from studies of the social world in Old Testament periods about which extra-biblical sources and field archeology can provide more information.

a. People normally speak and use a language in such a way as to give some hint about their identity and elicit some reaction from other people. Recognizing, commenting and reproducing other people's speech often reflect certain group-awareness and attitudes toward outsiders. There are passages in the Hebrew Bible that show these attitudes. Judg 12,6 tells how the Ephraimites gave themselves away when they were asked to pronounce the word *חֶלֶב* by the Gileadites. It is true that the exact phonetic shape of Ephraimite

⁽¹⁹⁾ This explains the hypercorrection in the speech of the lower working class people in New York City: they often pronounce words like *god*, *father*, *Dakota*, and *data* as if they were *gard*, *farther*, *Dakotar*, and *datar*; see further LABOV, *The Social Stratification*, 344-346.

pronunciation is still unclear⁽²⁰⁾. In any case, the point of the story is that foreigners (from the storyteller's point of view!) are generally recognized by their speech⁽²¹⁾. Furthermore, the shibboleth episode also shows the storyteller's skill in using dialectal variation for literary purposes. The storyteller brings up this incident to emphasize the lack of solidarity among the Ephraimites and the Gileadites against the Ammonites. It is also evident that the storyteller's sympathy is entirely with the Gileadites.

A similar situation is reflected in Nehemiah's complaint (Neh 13,24) about the lack of knowledge of Hebrew among the Jewish children. Nehemiah in fact condemned mixed marriages between Jews and foreign women because half of their children spoke "the language of Ashdod", glossed as *וּכְלָשׁוֹן עַם רַעַם* 'that is, like the language of various people', but not "the language of Judah". This passage reveals not only the linguistic situation after the Exile but also the attitude of Nehemiah's group toward other groups.

The shibboleth episode and Nehemiah's complaints reveal more about the Biblical writer's craft than about pronunciation of sibilants or diminishing fluency in one's own native tongue. Thus the two passages should not be seen primarily as indications of dialectal realities but rather as literary devices based on those realities.

Several phenomena in the transmission of the Hebrew texts may reveal changes of attitude toward the pronunciation of certain words or expressions. The preference for the hypercorrect pronunciation [*b^eōr*] written *בְּאֵר* 'cistern' against the shorter [*bōr*] written *בּוֹר* or *בֹּאֵר* ⁽²²⁾ reflects a tradition that distanced itself from

⁽²⁰⁾ For various proposals, see P. SWIGGERS, "The word *šibbōleṭ* in Jud. xii.6", *JSS* 26 (1981) 205-207; KAUFMAN, "The Classification", 56. Nevertheless it can be assumed that the Ephraimites would be capable of imitating the Gileadites' pronunciation in careful speech. But in spontaneous use, they would tend to produce their own pronunciation. E. N. KOFFI, *Language and Society in Biblical Times* (San Francisco no date) 74-76 explains that /š/ is "de-palatalized" when it follows /i/, and is pronounced as [s]. But the lack of other examples makes this hypothesis unlikely. In addition to this, the hypothesis would do away with the storyteller's use of the regional variation of the pronunciation and miss the point of the story.

⁽²¹⁾ Compare this with the NT episode where Peter's accent betrayed him as a Galilean in Matt 26,73. Interestingly enough, Mark and Luke do not report this dialectal observation.

⁽²²⁾ This is also true for pairs like *בְּאֵר* and *בּוֹר* 'cistern'; *זָאֵב* and *יָב* 'wolf'; *מָאֵם* and *מִם* 'blemish'.

the tradition which prefers the shorter form that is preserved in the Secunda, the Palestinian pointing, and the Samaritan. The Ketiv עפל 'boil', which was later considered offensive, is to be read aloud, as prescribed in the Qere, as טחר wherever it occurs (1 Sam 5,9.12; 6,4.5; Deut 28,27). Similarly, the word denoting male sexual activity, שגל later considered taboo, is to be substituted with the Qere שכב 'to lie down' (Deut 28,30; Isa 13,16; Zech 14,2; Jer 3,2). These Qere-Ketiv cases are an evidence that in the post-biblical era עפל and שגל came to be considered as offensive and therefore are not to be used in a solemn reading. The well-known pointing or the prescribed pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton is another example of a changing attitude, in this case, unlike the previous case, arising from a feeling of reverence.

b. Various social status and relations are reflected by the use of alternate forms of address or self-reference⁽²³⁾. The non-pronominal forms of address in conversation reveal different social relations; an inferior addresses a superior as אדני 'my lord' rather than אתה 'you' which will not express inferior-superior distance. In referring to oneself before a superior, an inferior uses שפחתך, עבדך, literally, 'your slave', 'your maidservant', 'your slave-girl'. These alternate forms of address are not merely polite forms but also forms that indicate social distance. Abigail addressed David as אדני 'my lord' (1 Sam 25,24.25.26.27.28.29.30.31). The woman from Tekoa used אדני המלך 'my lord the king' (2 Sam 14,9.12.18.19) or המלך 'the king' alone (vv.4.9.11.13.15.16) when speaking to David who had in the meantime become king. These women seem to avoid using אתה 'you'. In referring to herself, each of these women used שפחתך 'your maidservant' (1 Sam 25,27; 2 Sam 14,6.7.12.15.17) or אמתך 'your handmaid' (1 Sam 25,25.28.41); these expressions are for all practical purposes interchangeable. Before he became king, David was addressed simply as אתה by his wife, Michal (1 Sam 19,11). But by the time he was king, the form of address used by another wife, Batsheba, is אדני המלך 'my lord the king' (1 Kgs 1,18.20.21.31) or אדני 'my lord' (v.17) alone, but not המלך 'the king' as is the case with the woman of Tekoa. Obviously this is because their social relations with David are quite

(23) This correlation will give a further dimension to the enormous amount of data presented in E.J. REVELL, *The Designation of the Individual: Expressive Usage in Biblical Narrative* (Kampen 1996).

different. This also suggests that the use of alternate forms of address or self-reference expresses the social attitude of an inferior toward a superior that has priority over the social relation between husband and wife. Ruth addressed Boas as אֲדֹנָי before she became intimate with him (Ruth 2,13). Later, in the threshing floor episode (Ruth 3,9) she addressed him as אִמָּה, thus foreshadowing the husband-wife relation at the end of the story.

While affirming his innocence before Saul, David refers to himself as כלב מת 'dead dog' (1 Sam 24,15) without any self-disparaging connotation. In fact, here David wants to affirm that he still regards Saul as lawful king. The expression 'dog' actually functions as a political metaphor to indicate submission and loyalty to a lawful superior⁽²⁴⁾. In 2 Sam 9,8 Mephiboseth, the only offspring of Saul to survive, refers to himself before David as 'dead dog', acknowledging David's authority as king and pledging his loyalty to him. This is part of the narrator's skills to tell the reader that Mephiboseth simply renounces his right as claimant to his father's throne. The expression is also found with a sarcastic reversal of roles as in 1 Sam 17,43 (the warrior Goliath to David). The expression acquires a pejorative sense only when it is applied not to the speaker but to a third person as in 2 Sam 16,9: Abishai said about Shimei, "Why should this *dead dog* curse my lord the king?"

c. Diversity in theophoric elements in proper names may correlate with different religious preferences. The distribution of the elements *yah*, *yo*, *El* or other deities in personal names and geographical names gives some information about religious preferences. As shown by de Moor⁽²⁵⁾, theophoric personal names

⁽²⁴⁾ The essential part is the word for 'dog', the qualification 'dead' serves to give more emphasis. This usage is well-attested outside the Hebrew Bible. In his letters to his superior, the official from Lakhis called himself 'dog': KAI 192,4; 195,4; 196,3. This political sense of 'dog' finds abundant parallels in the Amarna letters written by the local rulers of Canaan to the Egyptian king, see J. M. GALÁN, "What is he, the dog", *UF* 25 (1993) 173-180.

⁽²⁵⁾ J. C. DE MOOR, *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* (Leuven 1990) 10-41. This part of the book complements two recent monographs on the religious significance of Israelite personal names: J. H. TIGAY, *You Shall Have No Other Gods*. Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions (Atlanta 1986) and J. D. FOWLER, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew*. A Comparative Study (Sheffield 1988).

up to the time of David show a preference for El and not for Yahweh. Yet the high frequency of Yahweh-names before David's time suggests that the worship of Yahweh must have started long before David. Again the correspondence in meaning of many El names and Yahweh names suggests that El and Yahweh were names of the same deity⁽²⁶⁾. Names of Canaanite deities such as Shemesh, Rephaim, Ashtoreth occurring in the geographical names during the period before the Davidic monarchy suggest that the Canaanite world was not abruptly rejected by the Israelites. This fact may serve as evidence for the idea that the penetration of Israel into the Canaanite world took place over a long period of time. On the other hand one may recall the practice of changing names in the Bible. The change of Jerubbaal's name (i.e., "Baal is great"; unlike Judg 6,32) to Gideon (i.e., "He has cut into pieces") is explained as a consequence of his breaking to pieces — גִּדַע — of the altar of Baal and the Asherah that belonged to his father, Joash (i.e., "Yahweh has helped"). The story is undoubtedly intended as a polemic against Baal worship by a certain group of Israelites from a later period.

It is useful to take a brief look at the personal names in the Samaria ostraca. The corpus has seven personal names with the element בעל and eleven other bearing the element יהו, יה, or יי. This situation suggests the existence of competing religious preferences in that period⁽²⁷⁾. Whether the preferences are mutually exclusive or tolerant is open to further study.

2. Some Registers

The Hebrew Bible contains some registers that are connected with diglossia, code-switching, various types of discourse, and archaizing poetic conventions.

a. Diglossia arises when there are two notably different varieties of a language in a speech-community, usually the spoken variety as distinct from the written form. Each variety is to a certain degree standardized and each performs specific social functions.

⁽²⁶⁾ Here are several examples: יואב אביה, אליאב 'El/Yahweh is Father'; עזריהו, אלעזר, אליעזר 'El/Yahweh is Helper'; for the complete inventory, see DE MOOR, *The Rise of Yahwism*, 33-34.

⁽²⁷⁾ Already recognized by M. NOTH, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart 1928) 120.

The varieties are usually described as "high" and "low", corresponding broadly to a difference in formality. In this connection Rendsburg's monograph on diglossia deserves special mention⁽²⁸⁾. On the basis of well-documented evidence, he claims that diglossia was a result of the standardization of Hebrew that took place in Jerusalem by 1000 BC. After 586 BC the written form underwent changes under the influence of the spoken language. After 70 AD the classical standards were lost and the spoken language became the written language. Hence, throughout the biblical period the two forms of Hebrew always existed side by side. Even though not everybody will share Rendsburg's views on the origins and forms of diglossia, his works contain a large amount of data which can be useful for further investigation. At this point one may note two things. First, as regards the 598 cases of spoken features discussed in the book, one may ask if some of these represent substandard usage, such as gender incongruence, rather than true colloquial forms. Second, the preservation of colloquial forms in the Hebrew Bible may be due more to literary motivations than Rendsburg would allow. One such important factor will be the literary conventions of a time that allowed for more spoken forms to be included in a composition.

A rather different interpretation of diglossia in Hebrew is given by Young⁽²⁹⁾. He suggests that the prestige of the Hebrew language is the reason why different groups of people in Canaanite society that were to become Israel adopted Hebrew as their language. While this may sufficiently explain why Hebrew and not another Canaanite dialect was chosen, the question about the origin of diversity within Hebrew itself nevertheless remains largely unanswered. The diverse origin of its first speakers is only one factor of the diversity in Hebrew. Changes that occurred in later periods have to be taken into account. In this respect Rendsburg's analysis outlined above is more revealing. Nonetheless, both Rendsburg and Young have shown, using their own frameworks, how colloquial expressions and other variant forms are used by the Biblical writers with the intention of giving more sense of naturalness to storytelling in general⁽³⁰⁾.

(28) G. A. RENDSBURG, *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew* (AOS 72; New Haven 1990).

(29) I. YOUNG, *Diversity in Pre-exilic Hebrew* (FAT 5; Tübingen 1993).

(30) See RENDSBURG, *Diglossia*, 157; id., "Linguistic Variation and the 'Foreign' Factor", 188-190; YOUNG, *Diversity*, 122-171; id., "The 'Northernisms'", 63-70.

The occasional occurrence of colloquial forms or regional variants has also something to do with code-switching discussed below.

b. Code-switching is the use of more than one language, dialect, or variety in a continuous text or speech, depending on such factors as audience and topic. The switch from Hebrew to Aramaic in Gen 31,47 and Jer 10,11 are examples of code-switching by means of the use of two languages to make the story more vivid⁽³¹⁾.

There are also examples of code-switching within Hebrew itself. One important example is found in Am 8,2. By using the word *qays* 'summer fruit', Amos wants to get his northern audience to think of *qēš* 'hour of doom'. The prophet must have been aware that *ay* corresponded to *ē* in the north. This world-play in fact says something more: the audience cannot avoid seeing their imminent destruction, even if they try to deny it. They have understood it! Amos's pun shows how code-switching can be effectively used for literary purposes. The Elihu speeches (Job 32–37) contain examples of code-switching from standard Hebrew to Transjordanian Hebrew⁽³²⁾. Again, the same character in 1 Kgs 17 – 2 Kgs 10, as shown by Young, produces both northern features and standard features⁽³³⁾. Therefore Young's reluctance to see the composition as a specimen of northern Hebrew is quite justified. The occasional switch to northern forms is used by the storyteller to help the reader imagine that Elisha is speaking, from the Judahite point of view, to a foreign woman.

The occurrences of older forms in a passage featuring normal forms in Hebrew poetry can be explained as the switching back and forth between solemn and normal style. The preservation of III-Y with nun paragogicum (אֵל תִּדְמֶיךָ 'you would liken (God)' (Isa 40,18) or without it תִּדְמֶינִי 'you would liken me' (Isa 40,25; 46,5) illustrates such code-switching. The presence of these isolated archaic forms in normal speech is non-intrusive, but the effect is immediately felt.

⁽³¹⁾ Contrary to the usual explanation, these Aramaic expressions cannot simply be called glosses since on both occasions they appear in the LXX and other ancient translations.

⁽³²⁾ KAUFMAN, "The Classification", 54-55 (see note 5).

⁽³³⁾ For example, Elisha uses northern forms such as אַחִי 'you' (fsg) and the suffixal form ׁ- side by side with the standard form אַח and ׁ-; see YOUNG, "The 'Northernisms'", 65.

c. As shown by Longacre⁽³⁴⁾, various types of discourse, such as exhortatory speech, narrative, expository discourse, also determine the meaning and use of verbal forms. The form *wayyiqtol* makes sense in a passage where a chain of events is being narrated, but not elsewhere. Thus an exhortation will naturally not use this form. The distribution and meaning of the form *yiqtol* in various types of discourse is also clear. In an exposition, such a form will refer to the present-future, hence the normal use of the imperfect. but in an exhortation the form will most likely be an expression of a desire or a wish, that is, it will be closer to the traditional notion of the jussive, even in cases where the jussive form is normally shorter⁽³⁵⁾. Discourse-based grammar can be very complicated, but it gives fuller consideration to the situation of speech — hence register — more than sentence-based grammar.

d. There is a special type of register that affects the interpretation of the preformative conjugation *yiqtol* in archaizing poetic usage. This verbal form eludes any interpretation that tries to pinpoint whether its basic value is tense or aspect or modality⁽³⁶⁾. One has the impression that too much importance has been given to the idea that *yiqtol* is a reflection of West Semitic preterite usage. In fact this usage is known mostly from poetic texts. In non-poetic texts the preterite usage of *yiqtol* is found exclusively in co-occurrence with

(34) R.E. LONGACRE, "Interpreting Biblical Stories", *Discourse and Literature* (ed. T.A. VAN DIJK) (Amsterdam 1985) 169-185. R.E. LONGACRE, *Joseph, a Story of Divine Providence: A Text-theoretical and Text-linguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39-48* (Winona Lake 1989); id., "Discourse Perspective on the Hebrew Verb: Affirmation and Restatement", *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* (ed. W. BODINE) (Winona Lake 1992) 177-189; id., "*W^eqatal* Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose", *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. R.D. BERGEN) (Dallas 1994) 50-98; R.E. LONGACRE-Shin Ja J. HWANG, "A Textlinguistic Approach to the Biblical Hebrew", *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. R.D. BERGEN) (Dallas 1994) 336-358.

(35) Therefore in a number of cases the imperfect expresses a wish; GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH 107*p* contains examples of 'al + imperfect, not jussive: Gen 19,17; Josh 1,7; 1 Sam 12,19; 1 Sam 25,25; Ps 121,3.

(36) For a summary of the different views as to whether the form basically represents tense or aspect, see L. MCFALL, *The Enigma of Hebrew Verbal System* (Sheffield 1982); for more recent discussions, B. WALTKE-M. O'CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake 1990) 445-478, 496-502.

אז 'then' or טרם 'before' and עד 'until'. Historical-comparative evidence points in diverse directions. In Ugaritic literary texts, *yaqtul* mainly expresses the preterite; hence its main use as past tense⁽³⁷⁾. In non-poetic texts the form is used as a generic present-future tense. In the Canaanite Amarna corpus the use of *yaqtul* as past tense is very rare⁽³⁸⁾. But, since the Amarna corpus consists of non-literary texts and its language is a mixture of Canaanite and Akkadian, it is difficult to draw further conclusions that would shed light on the Hebrew usage of *yiqtol*. Here Ugaritic has been considered more useful. In many cases the preterite usage of *yiqtol* in archaic Hebrew poetry corresponds to *yaqtul* in Ugaritic literary texts. However, this is not always so when one looks at the particular passages taken from Exod 15 given below. There *yiqtol* may denote a past tense on one occasion and a present-future tense on another even in a closely-connected passage. Some grammarians think that aspect lies behind the use of *yiqtol*. But even a cursory reading will show that not every occurrence can be so explained.

This seemingly chaotic usage becomes less problematic once the subject of *yiqtol* is taken into consideration. This will be clear from the following examples taken from Exod 15. If the subject is Yahweh or his actions, *yiqtol* primarily functions as a narrative tense and refers to actions that, in the poet's point of view, took place in the past. It is irrelevant whether the inception, duration or result of the event is meant. In other words, aspect plays no significant role here.

Your right hand, o Yahweh, תִּרְעַץ *shattered* the enemy (v. 6).

In the greatness of your majesty, תִּהְרֹס you *overthrew* your adversaries, תִּשְׁלֶה you *sent forth* your fury, יֶאֱכְלוּ *it consumed* them (v. 7).

וְתַבְּאֵמוּ וְתַטְעֵמוּ You *brought and planted* them in your own mountain (v. 17).

⁽³⁷⁾ See E. VERREET, *Modi ugaritici: Eine morpho-syntaktische Abhandlung über das Modalsystem im Ugaritischen* (Leuven 1988) 61-74; also see my review in *Bib* 70 (1989) 572-574 with several proposals about the use of this verbal form from a discourse-grammar point of view.

⁽³⁸⁾ A.F. RAINEY, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets. A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialects Used By Scribes from Canaan*, vol. 2 (Leiden 1996) 222-227.

Descriptively speaking, the examples suggest that the primary grammatical meaning of the verbal form *yiqtol* as tense, aspect, or modality is determined by the semantic content of the subject. Actually there is nothing new in this. But what is special to the Hebrew text is the correlation between the semantic feature 'The God of Israel' of the subject and the 'preterite' sense of the verbs.

The descriptive principle above also holds true for other parts of the text. When the subject has the semantic feature 'the faithful', in this case, the Israelites, *yiqtol* primarily expresses some wish, hence the modal nuances are important. Tense and aspect as such become irrelevant.

אֲשִׁירָה I will sing ...; וְאֶמְנֶה and I will praise him; אֶרְמָמְנֶה and I will exalt him (vv. 1-2).

(terror had fallen upon them, i.e., inhabitants of Canaan)
יַעֲבֹר עִמָּךְ so that (lit.: 'until') your people *could* pass ... (v. 16).

With a third party as subject, the aspectual sense of *yiqtol* becomes dominant while time reference and modality become irrelevant. It will be observed that the subject bears the semantic feature 'hostile forces' for the biblical writers.

(context v. 4: the Lord cast [pf.] Pharaoh's chariots and his host into the sea and his chosen officers were drowned [pf.] in the Sea of Reeds) and the floods יִכְסֹּמוּ were engulfing them (v. 5).

(When you stretched [pf.] your right hand,) the earth תִּבְלַעֲמָהוּ started to swallow them (v. 12).

יִרְדּוּן they were trembling; ... fear יֵאָחֲזֵמָה had seized them; (terror and dread) תִּפֹּל had fallen upon them; יִדְמוּ they were as dumb as stone (vv. 14-16).

In v. 5 the verb describes the continuous movement of the floods; hence the progressive aspect. This aspect reappears in two verbs in vv. 14-16 that describe the trembling and speechless Egyptians. The other two verbs in vv. 14-16 express the completion of the action; hence the perfective aspect. The inceptive aspect appears in v. 12 where the verbs indicate the start of the action of swallowing by the earth.

The point raised here is that a special register is at work in an archaic (or archaizing) Hebrew poem such as Exod 15. In this register one facet of the verbal form prevails over the other depending on the semantic content of the subject. Therefore it

makes little sense to establish in general terms whether the basic value of *yiqtol* in such a corpus is tense, aspect, or modality. One can test this observation by comparing it with an archaizing passage in Job 38,37-38:

Who **יִסְפֹּר** *numbered/can number/numbers* the clouds by means of wisdom? Who **יִשְׁבִּיב** *tilted/can tilt/tilts* the waterskins of the heavens, while the dust runs into a mass, and the clods **יִדְבְּקוּ** *cling fast* together?

The meaning of **יִשְׁבִּיב** depends on who is seen as the subject. If it is Yahweh, then the past narrative is more appropriate. If it is Job or for that matter, the faithful in general, the modal sense is better. If one thinks of a third party, the aspectual sense will do. And this is the case with the clods that **יִדְבְּקוּ** remains cleaving to each other. Here it is unwise to give more importance to tense or modality over aspect.

3. *A Concluding Remark*

Attitudes toward foreign speech, social relations, religious preferences are reflected in the representation of varying pronunciation, the use of non-pronominal forms of self-reference, and the theophoric personal/geographical names respectively. These social markers, together with special registers, such as the occurrence of colloquial forms, code-switching, different discourse types, and the use of archaizing poetic conventions are part of the mechanism which shaped the language of the Hebrew Bible and which also produced elements of diversity of Hebrew. Further investigation will reveal other social markers and registers than those discussed thus far. In dealing with such phenomena it is more important to ask how these sociolinguistic variations were used by the biblical writers rather than trying to reconstruct the social realities reflected in these variations.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

AGUSTINUS GIANTO

ANIMADVERSIONES

The Syntactic Structure of the Ritual of Ordination (Lev 8)

Syntax and structure of a given passage are closely intertwined. Specifically in regard to texts dealing with ritual action, it is important to understand the syntactic conventions which in turn may help in interpreting the actual ritual performance. One of the main assumptions of this study is the fact that syntactic structure did not “just occur” but rather that one encounters regularly a well-thought-through pattern which often assists the exegete when attempting to uncover the meaning of a specific section⁽¹⁾.

I. The Macro-structure of Lev 8

Lev 8 and the ordination ritual of Aaron and his sons reveals a clear-cut chiasmic structure⁽²⁾. The primary “organizational phrase-motif” of Lev 8 can be found in the sevenfold repetition of the phrase *כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה*, “as the Lord commanded” (Lev 8,4,9,13,17,21,29,36). J. Blenkinsopp has pointed out two main formulaic expressions in what has commonly been called P (or the priestly stratum), namely (1) those which indicate the successful completion of a work⁽³⁾, and (2) those which describe the execution of a command given directly or indirectly by God. The above mentioned phrase falls into the second category.

Blenkinsopp⁽⁴⁾ mentions several occurrences of the phrase in the priestly corpus, including the construction of the sanctuary and the priestly

⁽¹⁾ The present study is partly based on a D.Litt. thesis submitted by the author to the Department of Ancient Near Eastern Studies at the University of Stellenbosch (South Africa) in January 1995. The title of the thesis is *Ordination and Ritual: On the Symbolism of Time, Space, and Actions in Leviticus 8*.

⁽²⁾ See on this J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 1–16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York 1991) 544.

⁽³⁾ See J. BLENKINSOPP, “The Structure of P”, *CBQ* 38 (1976) 275-276, 280-283 who maintains that the solemn conclusion formula is restricted to three points in the history of Israel: (1) the creation of the world (Gen 2,1-2); (2) construction of the wilderness sanctuary and its appointments (Exod 39,32; 40,33); and (3) the division of the land among the tribes after the setting up of the wilderness sanctuary at Shiloh (Josh 19,51). It appears that one constant marker of this formulaic expression is a verbal form of the root *כִּי*. The governing noun or person is not always God, but it can also refer to work on the Tabernacle being finished, or to Moses. He further maintains that the covenant with Abraham (Gen 17) — a significant part of OT theology — is not to be included in this structural pattern. Compare BLENKINSOPP, “Structure”, 278. This does not appear to take Gen 17,22 into account which states: *וַיְכַל לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ וַיַּעַל אֱלֹהִים מֵעַל אֲבְרָהָם*, “and he [the Lord] finished talking with him and the Lord went up from before Abraham”. While this is *before* the short description of the fulfillment of Abraham’s part of the covenant in Gen 17,23, it nevertheless appears to be governing the narrative, inasmuch as the Lord, one of the main “characters” in the chapter, disappears.

⁽⁴⁾ BLENKINSOPP, “Structure”, 276-277.

garments (Exod 39,1.5.7.21.26.29.31)⁽⁵⁾, and in the description of the setting up and furnishing of the sanctuary (Exod 40,19.21.23.25.27.29.32). In both instances the phrase occurs seven times (as in Lev 8). This demonstrates the literary affinity of Exod 39–40 to Lev 8⁽⁶⁾. The sevenfold phrase gives a good indication of the macro-structure of the section⁽⁷⁾.

The phrase-motif helps to indicate the chiasmic layout of Lev 8 — both structurally and content-wise. The first two corresponding sections A and A' contain a command-fulfillment section (vv. 1-5; 31-36) — the first one referring to the assembling of materials and persons, while the later one concerns the instructions concerning the following seven days. Sections B and B' regarding the anointing of Aaron and — later on — his sons (vv. 6-13; 30) are not equally weighted in terms of textual density, but they function as a parenthesis of the actual center of the ritual. One should also note the intrusion of the anointing of the sanctuary and its objects which forms part of the ritual sub-process of the anointing of Aaron. The central section of the ritual can be found in vv. 14-29 which describe the sacrificial service and which should be understood as the centerpiece of the chapter⁽⁸⁾.

II. Syntactic Micro-structure of Lev 8

After having indicated the literary macro-structure of Lev 8, we will now turn to the syntactic micro-structure of the chapter. Since Lev 8 is part of the main narrative section of Leviticus (chapters 8–10) the predominant verbal aspect utilized is the *wayyqtl* form. This appears to be significant in terms of the order and sequence of the ritual. Gesenius and Kautzsch⁽⁹⁾ maintain that the *wayyqtl* is used predominantly in order to depict a time sequence⁽¹⁰⁾. Waltke and O'Connor⁽¹¹⁾ suggest as the basic premise for the discussion of the *wayyqtl* that the “*wa(y)*- element is related to the conjunction ׀, and connects one situation with another”. The exact nature of this connection is thus to be determined⁽¹²⁾. They also hold that there are always two features present, specifically *subordination and the perfective*

⁽⁵⁾ Exod 39,32 and v. 42 are a summary of the completed work.

⁽⁶⁾ Both sections fall into the category of *Ausführungsberichte*.

⁽⁷⁾ This is also observed by MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 543: “The septenary occurrence of this formula cannot be regarded as a matter of chance for it is used twice more, in the priestly accounts of the manufacture of the priestly garments... and of the assembling of the Tabernacle”. Compare also J. KEARNEY, “Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex. 25-40”, *ZAW* 89 (1977) 375-386.

⁽⁸⁾ For more details see G.A. KLINGBEIL, *Ordination and Ritual. On the Symbolism of Time, Space, and Actions in Leviticus 8*, unpubl. D.Litt dissertation (Stellenbosch 1995) 83-88.

⁽⁹⁾ W. GESENIUS – E. KAUTZSCH, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig 26 1896) 319.

⁽¹⁰⁾ This is also suggested by P. JOÜON, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, transl. and revised by T. MURAOKA (Subsidia Biblica 14/I-II; Rome 1991) 386-387.

⁽¹¹⁾ B.K. WALTKE – M. O'CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake 1990) 545.

⁽¹²⁾ It should be noted that the most important textual junctures connecting the main structures of the chiasmus are all comprised of the *wayyqtl* forms, namely ׀ linking section A and B, ׀ connecting section B and X, ׀ tying section X to B', and ׀ linking the final section B' to A'.

aspect⁽¹³⁾. These aspects of succession⁽¹⁴⁾ (or sequence) and subordination have to be understood before one may attempt to draw exegetical conclusions⁽¹⁵⁾. According to the Waltke and O'Connor, several aspects of the *wayyqtl* can be differentiated⁽¹⁶⁾: (1) *Succession*, indicating logical succession where a logical entailment from a preceding situation is expressed⁽¹⁷⁾. (2) *Epexegetis*, where the *wayyqtl* form is utilized to explain the former situation⁽¹⁸⁾. (3) *Summary*, indicating a summary statement⁽¹⁹⁾.

The verbal forms of Lev 8 can be divided into the following categories⁽²⁰⁾.

(1) *Wayyqtl indicating succession*: vv. 1 וַיִּדְבֵּר 1⁽²¹⁾, 4 וַיַּעַשׂ 5 וַיֹּאמֶר 6-9 (all verbal forms), 10 וַיִּקַּח וַיִּשָּׂח 11 וַיִּקַּח 12-14 (all verbal forms), 15 וַיִּשָּׂח וַיִּקַּח וַיִּתֵּן 16 וַיִּקַּח 18-29 (all verbal forms), 30 וַיִּקַּח 31 וַיֹּאמֶר.

⁽¹³⁾ See on this WALTKE – O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Syntax*, 547.

⁽¹⁴⁾ There is a difference between temporal succession and logical succession. "Temporal sequence depends on objective fact outside the control of the speaker; logical sequence, by contrast, subjectively exists in the way a speaker sees the relationship between situations" (WALTKE – O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Syntax*, 547).

⁽¹⁵⁾ JOÜON, *Grammar*, 393 has pointed out the abuse of the *wayyqtl* form in its successive aspect on the basis of its frequent use. One example would be 1 Kgs 19,6 וַיֵּשֶׁב וַיֵּשֶׂה וַיֵּשָׁב "and he ate, and he drank, and he lay down (again)". Normally one would consider eating and drinking to be parallel actions. This notion is also expressed in the translation.

⁽¹⁶⁾ WALTKE – O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Syntax*, 547-554.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Succession is indicated by the form and not by the associations of words. See on this the example of Ps 40,2-4 or Gen 4,1 given by WALTKE – O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Syntax*, 548. JOÜON, *Grammar*, 392 differentiates between temporal and logical succession.

⁽¹⁸⁾ A good example of this aspect can be found in 2 Sam 14,5 אִשָּׁה-אֶלְמָנָה אֵין רִמָּה אִשִּׁי. "The major fact or situation is stated first, and then the particulars or details, component or concomitant situation are filled in". See WALTKE – O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Syntax*, 551. They continue to discuss two more aspects, namely the *Pluperfect* and the *dependent consequential situation*, both of which do not seem to appear in Lev 8.

⁽¹⁹⁾ A good example of this can be found in Gen 2,1 וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם וַיִּבְרָא אֶת-הַבְּהֵמָה וְאֶת-כָּל-חַי-הָאָרֶץ וְאֶת-כָּל-רֶמֶשׂ הָאָרֶץ וְאֶת-כָּל-רֶמֶשׂ הָאָרֶץ וְאֶת-כָּל-רֶמֶשׂ הָאָרֶץ. Waltke and O'Connor include this aspect among the various meanings of the *successive* aspect of the *wayyqtl*. In view of the broad spectrum of meanings of the successive aspect (which could lead to a loss of specific distinctions) it will be included separately.

⁽²⁰⁾ It should be noted that only the most important forms of each category will be mentioned here. For a more extensive form-by-form analysis see KLINGBEIL, *Ordination and Ritual*, 90-93.

⁽²¹⁾ As already shown above, there is a connection between Exod 40 and Lev 8 inasmuch as both represent *Ausführungsberichte* of previously given commands. Thus the aspect of the *wayyqtl* form in Lev 8,1 should be understood in terms of its succession to Exod 40,33. Exod 40,34-38 contains a description of the presence of the Lord in the cloud covering the Tabernacle and is to be seen in its explanatory function for the previously described completion of the Tent of Meeting.

⁽²²⁾ One could also argue to understand this *wayyqtl* form as an epexegetical expression rather than indicating succession. Lev 8,11 appears to be another epexegetical statement, describing the act of anointing and consecrating in more precise terms.

⁽²³⁾ The *taking* of blood is always for a specific purpose such as smearing it around the horns of the altar of burnt offering or dashing it against the sides of the altar. It is also taken for the mixture used in the daubing rite upon Aaron's (and his

(2) *Wayyqtl indicating epexegetis*: vv. 4 וַתִּקְהַל⁽²⁴⁾, 10 וַיִּקְדָּשׁ⁽²⁵⁾, 15 וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ, וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּ⁽²⁶⁾, and 30 וַיִּקְדָּשׁ.

(3) *Wayyqtl indication a summary statement*: v. 36 וַיִּבְרַח.

64% of the verbal forms used in Lev 8 are *wayyqtl* forms, which are generally used in narrative sections⁽²⁷⁾. This conforms to the descriptive (or narrative) character of the chapter as compared to the prescriptive nature of, for example, Lev 1–7. There is only one ו + Perf. form⁽²⁸⁾ in the whole chapter which, according to Koch⁽²⁹⁾, would indicate the genre *Ritual*⁽³⁰⁾. Out of these between 81–89%⁽³¹⁾ fall into the category of *succession* statements, while some 9% should be interpreted in terms of *epexegetis*. Only one *wayyqtl* form represents a summary statement. Furthermore there is a conspicuous accumulation of Perf. forms apparently corresponding to the outlined chiasmic structure of the chapter⁽³²⁾.

sons') right extremities. Therefore one could understand the process of *sprinkling* as an epexegetical statement.

⁽²⁴⁾ The phrase explains the previous statement, namely that "Moses did as the Lord had commanded him". It also refers back to the imperative found in Lev 8,3.

⁽²⁵⁾ MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 516 calls the *waw* "purposive". In view of the parallelism to Lev 8,11 and the usage of the infinitive constr. form וַיִּקְדָּשׁ one should argue for the epexegetical aspect of the *wayyqtl* form.

⁽²⁶⁾ This has also been suggested by F. H. GORMAN, JR., *The Ideology of Ritual. Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology* (JSOTSS 91; Sheffield 1990) 123 who interprets the *waw* as explanatory.

⁽²⁷⁾ The *waw-Imperfect* or *Imperfectum consecutivum* is used as the basic building pattern for narrative sections in the OT. Compare on this E. JENNI, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Basel – Frankfurt am Main 1981) 61 and WALTKE – O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Syntax*, 543–544. JENNI, *Lehrbuch*, 70 also calls it the *Narrativ*. The reference used in this study to this grammatical form is *wayyqtl* and is solely based on its morphological appearance. This terminology should be preferred to the often "meaning-laden" terminology of older grammars, such as the *waw consecutivum*. Concerning the meaning of the verbal aspect there is often no distinction between main clause and subordinate clause, since the Hebrew uses mainly a paratactic structure (ibid.) instead of the hypotactic structure ("untergeordnet"). This fact complicates the discussion of sequence and action in a narrative section. Compare on the *wayyqtl* also GESENIUS – KAUTZSCH, *Grammatik*, 129–131, 317–321. They also maintain that the *wayyqtl* is used predominantly "zur Darstellung einer zeitlichen Aufeinanderfolge von Handlungen oder Begebenheiten, so anderwärts zum Ausdruck solcher Handlungen u.s.w., welche eine logische Folge, resp. ein auf innerer Notwendigkeit beruhendes Ereignis aus dem Vorangegangenen darstellen". A discussion of the usage and meaning of the *wayyqtl* will follow below. Compare also A. NICCACCI, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* (JSOTSS 86; Sheffield 1990) 175 who maintains that *wayyqtl* chains are the "tense for narrative", expressing predominantly succession. He states: "In respect of linguistic attitude, WAYYIQTOL is the tense for narrative (§81); in respect of emphasis it denotes the foreground (§86); in respect of linguistic aspect it denotes degree zero (§88)" (ibid.).

⁽²⁸⁾ Namely וַיִּמְרָט in Lev 8,35.

⁽²⁹⁾ K. KOCH, "Alttestamentliche und altorientalische Rituale", *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte* (FS. R. Rendtorff; [eds. E. BLUM – C. MACHOLZ – E. W. STEGEMANN] Neukirchen-Vluyn 1990) 76.

⁽³⁰⁾ KOCH, "Rituale", 77 has somewhat retreated from his earlier summary statement, providing the possibility of explanatory inclusions and lists of elements that do not adhere to the stylistic pattern of the ו + Perfect structure.

⁽³¹⁾ The difference is due to some forms that could be interpreted in different ways.

⁽³²⁾ One exception to that observation is the recurring phrase

III. Relationship between Syntactic Structure and Ritual Performance

After having established the main syntactic feature of the ordination ritual in Lev 8 — namely the *wayyqtl* form as utilized in the narrative — the following discussion will focus upon the non-typical forms (e.g., ordinary perf. forms) that can be found in different strategic sections of the ritual⁽³³⁾. These forms appear predominantly in what can be called the centerpiece of the ritual, or, in other words, the sacrificial service (Lev 8,14-29).

Purification offering (הִטָּהַר - Lev 8,14-17)

Lev 8,14-17 describes the preparation and actual performance of the הִטָּהַר offering. Nine *wayyqtl* forms are employed describing the sequence of the sacrifice. Lev 8,15 uses the Perf. form פָּצַץ, “he poured out”. The action depicted refers to Moses’ purification of the altar. After Moses has put some blood of the הִטָּהַר offering on the horns of the altar⁽³⁴⁾, he “pours out” the rest of the blood at the base of the altar. The word used differs from the one used in Exod 29,12 which prescribes the specific rite⁽³⁵⁾, although — as already argued above — one can detect a certain freedom of use concerning differing terms in prescriptive and descriptive ritual texts in dealing with the same ritual. נָצַק appears also in Lev 9,9 in connection with the pouring out of blood at the base of the altar⁽³⁶⁾. Milgrom suggests that the purpose of this change of the time aspect of the verb could very well be to emphasize the blood rite as the key

פָּצַץ (Lev 8,4.9.13.17.21.29.36) constituting a Pi. Perf. 3. sg. m. form. Since this phrase plays a significant role in the over-all structure of the chapter itself and its relationship with other chapters in Exod (e.g., Exod 39 and 40) it should be viewed specifically in terms of its primary function as an “organizational phrase-motif” for the total chapter and ritual. Furthermore the command-fulfillment section (Lev 8,31-36) at the end of the ritual contains two more forms of the verbal *צוה*, namely צִוִּיתִי (Pi. Perf. 1. sg. c.) in Lev 8,31 and צִוִּיתִי (Pu. Perf. 1. sg. c.) in Lev 8,35. Both forms refer to Moses’ command and should be viewed in the command-structure *Lord-Moses-Aaron*. The more common pattern of הִטָּהַר פָּצַץ צוה cannot be used here, since Moses gives the command, although it nevertheless contains a command that Moses received from the Lord. The final exception is עָשָׂה in Lev 8,34. This should be understood in terms of the subject of the sentence, namely הִיְהוָה. MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 494. has translated this phrase as “everything done today” and argues that the subject is not impersonal but refers to God (not Moses!) himself (ibid., 540). If one accepts this interpretation of the verse, the Perf. form makes sense in view of the organizational phrase motif and the time aspect used in it.

⁽³³⁾ Besides the recurring perfect form צִוִּיתִי, which is part of the sevenfold phrase-motif “as the Lord commanded” and which indicates the larger macro-literary structure, the following perfect forms appear: vv. 15 וְצִקָּה, 17 וְשָׁרַךְ, 20 וְנָתַח, 21 וְרָחַץ, 26 וְלָקַח, and 34 וְעָשָׂה.

⁽³⁴⁾ The relationship of this rite with Lev 8,10-11 will be discussed below. MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 523 regards Lev 8,10-11 as an interpolation.

⁽³⁵⁾ Exod 29,12 uses an Imperf. form of שָׁרַךְ which is also used in the prescription of the type of sacrifice in Lev 4,7.18.25.30.34 and which should be considered the usual term for the act of pouring out the blood at the base of the altar.

⁽³⁶⁾ It is also utilized in Lev 14,26 where it denotes the pouring of oil into the

element of the *חֲטָאת* offering⁽³⁷⁾. It is noteworthy to mention the fact that its counterpart in Exod 29,12 *חֲטָאת* falls also out of the ordinary + Perf. forms pattern. Lev 9 employs the same pattern when the *חֲטָאת* offering is described (Lev 9,8-11), using predominantly *wayyqtl* forms with the exception of *יָצַק* in Lev 9,9⁽³⁸⁾. The prescription of the *חֲטָאת* offering can be found in Lev 4. It is interesting to mention that while the majority of all verbal forms follow the + Perf. pattern, the verbal form describing the action of pouring out the blood at the base of the altar is given as an Imperf. form⁽³⁹⁾. It is possible that the author/editor of Lev 8 wanted to emphasize the specific act of pouring out blood at the base of the altar in the rite of the *חֲטָאת* offering.

The other Perf. form in the pericope concerned with the purification offering can be found in Lev 8,17, namely *שָׂרַף* referring to the burning of the hide and its flesh outside the camp. As already mentioned above, Lev 4,12 employs a similar uncharacteristic pattern⁽⁴⁰⁾. Milgrom⁽⁴¹⁾ suggests that the abnormal occurrence indicates that this is the final rite in the *חֲטָאת* offering series⁽⁴²⁾. The prescriptive section in Exod 29,14 employs also an atypical *חֲטָאת* Imperf. form in a series of ו + Perf. forms. It thus appears as if the author/editor of Lev 8 adopted the same enigmatic usage of atypical verbal forms as can be found in the related section found in Lev 4 concerning the *חֲטָאת* offering and in Exod 29 concerning the prescription of the ordination of the priests. Besides the possibility of emphasis this could also be understood in terms of the nature of the ritual, namely as being a founding ritual.

Burnt offering (עֹלָה - Lev 8,18-21)

The section on the *עֹלָה* offering contains two more Perf. forms. The first one is *גָּזַח* in Lev 8,20 denoting the cutting of the burnt offering ram

hands of the priests. Furthermore it is used in Num 5,15 in connection with the ritual of the unfaithful wife. Here it is used to prescribe that no oil is to be poured on the special *קֶרֶן* 2 Kgs 3,11 utilizes the word in a somewhat differing context, namely referring to the status of Elisha as the one "who poured water on the hands of Elijah" — thus indicating a master-servant relationship. This in turn is enough to authenticate Elisha as a true prophet of the Lord. Ezek 24,3 describes the parable of the boiling pot into which Ezekiel is to pour some water. It is also used in the ritual of anointing the priest (Lev 21,10) and the king (2 Kgs 9,3.6). P.R. GILCHRIST, "יָצַק. Pour, pour out, cast", *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* I (Chicago 1980) 395 suggests that the "principle of inauguration or ordination to office is clearly involved", when this word is used, although it seems to be important to note the different contexts involving either oil (mostly inauguration rites) or water.

⁽³⁷⁾ MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 523.

⁽³⁸⁾ One difference is the number of verbs in the two chapters. While *יָצַק* is the seventh verbal form in Lev 8 (describing the purification offering), *יָצַק* in the fifth verbal form in Lev 9.

⁽³⁹⁾ The form used is *יִשְׂרַף* (Lev 4,7). The only other Imperf. forms used in Lev 4,3-12 are *יִסְרֹף* in Lev 4,9 and *יִשְׂרַף* in Lev 4,12.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ *יִשְׂרַף* is used in Lev 4,12 instead of the normal ו + Perf. pattern.

⁽⁴¹⁾ MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 525.

⁽⁴²⁾ Milgrom's argumentation does not seem to be consistent. While he maintains that the first occurrence of the Perf. form in an otherwise *wayyqtl* context should be interpreted as emphasizing the specific blood rite, the following "irregular" form indicates the final rite of the *חֲטָאת* offering.

into pieces. Exod 29,17 — the corresponding section in the prescriptive part of the ritual — again has the uncharacteristic form וַתִּשָּׂא instead of the expected $\text{ו} + \text{Perf. form}$. Milgrom⁽⁴³⁾ argues that this again indicates the final rite of the עֹלָה offering⁽⁴⁴⁾. Against Milgrom one could argue that the pericope contains one more Perf. form, namely וַיִּרְחֹץ in Lev 8,21. This refers to the act of washing the inner parts and the legs of the animal with water and is to be understood as a rite distinct from that of the cutting of the ram. The corresponding section in Exod 29,17 uses the typical וַיִּרְחֹץ ($\text{ו} + \text{Perf.}$) and thus differs from the previous occurrences. Interestingly Lev 1,9 employs the uncharacteristic וַיִּרְחֹץ . וַיִּרְחֹץ is the fifth verbal form in the pericope containing the description of the burnt offering, while וַיִּרְחֹץ is the seventh verbal form⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Ordination offering (מִלְאִים - Lev 8,22-29)

The section concerning the ordination offering also contains two Perf. forms, וַיִּלָּקֵחַ (Lev 8,26) and וַיִּהְיֶה (Lev 8,29). The atypical form of וַיִּלָּקֵחַ does not correspond with the prescription in Exod 29,23⁽⁴⁶⁾. The presence of the verbal form וַיִּהְיֶה in Lev 8,29 must be seen in the light of the usage of the verse in the overall context, since it contains an explanation of the strange fact that no piece was to be given to any offerer — in this case Moses himself⁽⁴⁷⁾. It appears possible that the author/editor of the chapter sought to emphasize this point and thus used an atypical Perf. form.

Figure 1 demonstrates graphically the occurrences of Perf. forms in the central section of the sacrificial service. They are mostly employed in harmony with the prescriptive section in Exod 29⁽⁴⁸⁾, i.e., when the prescription includes an atypical form, the description also utilizes an uncharacteristic verbal form. Milgrom has suggested that this might either be for the purpose of emphasis or in order to indicate the end of a specific rite. Another explanation of the atypical verbal forms would be in terms of their importance to the ritual itself. One might suggest that they indicated to the reader either a pause in performance or a rearrangement of the setting of the ritual or an indication for the reader to allow for parallel

⁽⁴³⁾ MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 526. I refer only to Milgrom's work since the other standard commentaries do not comment upon this phenomenon at all.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ It is interesting to note that the original prescription of the עֹלָה offering found in Lev 1,2-9 utilizes the characteristic וַיִּשָּׂא ($\text{ו} + \text{Perf.}$).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ On this point see also the usage of וַיִּצַק in Lev 8 and 9. While the Perf. form appears as the seventh verbal form in the section on the purification offering in Lev 8 it appears in the fifth place in Lev 9.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ The chain of nouns in Exod 29,23 is governed by the verb וַיִּלָּקֵחַ which can be found in Exod 29,22, exhibiting the expected structure. וַיִּלָּקֵחַ is the tenth verbal form in the מִלְאִים offering.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Since Moses was not a priest, he should not have received anything. MILGROM, *Leviticus*, 532 writes: "Indeed, he gets nothing from the offerers. The right thigh, which normally would have been given directly to the officiant by the offerer, is instead given over to God and burned on the altar".

⁽⁴⁸⁾ For a detailed discussion see the previous paragraphs.

Figure 1: Micro-structure of the sacrificial service in Lev 8 (boldface represents Perf. instead of the regular *wayyqtl* forms)

1. תִּמְחַת offering (vv. 14-17)

1. the bull of the purification offering is *led forward*
2. Aaron and his sons *lay* their hands upon the head of the bull
3. bull is *slaughtered*
4. Moses *takes* the blood
5. he *puts* some on the horns of the altar
6. he *purifies* the altar
7. **he pours out the blood at the base of the altar**
8. he *consecrates* it to make atonement for it
9. Moses *takes* the fat around the entrails
10. he *turns* them *into smoke* on the altar
11. **he burns the bull itself outside the camp with fire**

2. עֹלָה offering (vv. 18-21)

1. Moses *brings forward* the ram of burnt offering
2. Aaron and his sons *lay* their hands upon the head of the ram
3. ram is *slaughtered*
4. Moses *dashes* the blood against all sides of the altar
5. **ram is cut into its parts**
6. Moses *turns* the head, the parts, and the suet *into smoke*
7. **he washes the entrails and legs with water**
8. Moses *turns* whole ram *into smoke* on the altar

3. מִלֵּאִים offering (vv. 22-29)

1. Moses *brings forward* the ram of ordination
2. Aaron and his sons *lay* their hands upon the head of the ram
3. ram is *slaughtered*
4. Moses *takes* some of its blood
5. he *puts* it on the lobe of Aaron's right ear
6. he *brings forward* Aaron's sons
7. Moses *puts* some of the blood on the lobes of their right ears
8. he *dashes* the rest of the blood against all sides of the altar
9. he *takes* the fat
10. **he takes one bread from the basket of unleavened bread**
11. he *places* them on the fat and on the right thigh
12. he *places* all these on the palms of Aaron and his sons
13. he *raises* them as an elevation offering
14. Moses *takes* them from their hands
15. he *turns* them *into smoke* on the altar
16. he *takes* the breast
17. he *raises* it as an elevation offering before the Lord

execution to following (or previous) rites⁽⁴⁹⁾. This last possibility has also been recently suggested by Niccacci⁽⁵⁰⁾. The first Perf. form concerns the *pouring out* of the blood at the base of the altar. After daubing the horns of the altar — thus purifying them — Moses has to walk around the altar again in order to pour out the blood. One could argue here for a pause in the ritual performance or for the indication that Moses performed this rite parallel to the daubing of the horns of the altar⁽⁵¹⁾. The second act expressed with a Perf. form refers to the *burning* of the skin and the flesh of the *חֵטְאֵת* offering outside the camp. This is a definite change of setting and also required some time. If one would argue for the parallel execution indicated by the Perf. form, this would allow for a smoother performance of the next rite (without much time spent waiting for those that burned the skin and flesh outside the camp).

The next two Perf. forms can be found in the section describing the *עֹלָה* offering. After dashing the blood against the sides of the altar⁽⁵²⁾ the ram is *cut* into its parts. This required some time and was a good opportunity to pause in the procedure. It appears that this occurrence does not allow for parallel performance inasmuch as the following rite is based on the cutting of the ram into pieces. This is followed by the turning of the head, parts and the suet into smoke (regular *wayyqtl* form) and the *washing* of the entrails and legs with water (Perf. form). Again one notices a change in setting and activity⁽⁵³⁾.

The last Perf. form of Lev 8 with significance for the proposed hypothesis concerns the *taking* of one cake from the basket of unleavened bread after Moses has taken the fat. This is undertaken in order to prepare for the elevation offering and it does suggest that Moses had to go to the basket of unleavened bread in order to pick up one cake.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ This hypothesis is based on the assumption that the author/editor of the chapter did not just describe the performance of the ritual as it came to his mind, but rather that he had a literary plan in mind. This appears obvious when looking at the usage of the motif-phrase *וַיַּעַשׂ כְּכָל* throughout Lev 8 (or Exod 39 and 40 for that matter).

⁽⁵⁰⁾ The present author's and Niccacci's observation were arrived at independently of each other. Only after the possibility of parallel performance was taken into consideration, did NICCACCI's work on *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* come to the present author's attention. NICCACCI, *Syntax*, 63 submits that often *wayyqtl* chains are broken by *waw-x-qatal* constructions. Citing examples from Exod 9,23 and 10,13, he continues to suggest that they express simultaneity. This tense shift could also be expressed as a shift "from foreground to background". Compare NICCACCI, *Syntax*, 116.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Thus it would mean that Moses — while daubing the altar and walking around the altar — poured out some blood at the same time.

⁽⁵²⁾ Interestingly this act is not described with a Perf. form, although it appears to be similar to the act of pouring out the blood at the base of the altar. Two different Hebrew roots are used and thus the acts may have been considerably different.

⁽⁵³⁾ Where were the legs and the entrails washed? Did the priests have to take them to another place in the confines of the Tent of Meeting or did they bring a basin of water to the altar?

Since Lev 8 and 9 are the only narrative sections in the book of Leviticus⁽⁵⁴⁾ concerned with the actual ritual performance of earlier prescribed rituals, they have to be investigated together. Lev 9 appears to support the suggested hypothesis, since it also contains several Perf. forms in an otherwise strictly *wayyqtl* pattern. After the introductory command-fulfillment section (Lev 9,1-4), which contains some Perf. forms although they should be disregarded for the present argumentation since they do not pertain to the actual ritual performance, there are three Perf. forms in Lev 9,9-11 (together with *wayyqtl* forms in the same verses), namely יָצַק (Lev 9,9), הִקְטִיר (Lev 9,10), and שָׂרַף (Lev 9,11). All three can be found in the context of the הִשָּׂאת offering. Two of those verbs correspond to the forms found in Lev 8. Furthermore, there is the Hi. Perf. form הִנִּיף in Lev 9,21 referring to the raising of the breast and the right thigh as an elevation offering. As with the occurrences in Lev 8, all forms mark an act that might require a previous pause in the ritual. The *pouring out* of the blood indicates the end of the specific rite concerned with blood and most probably required Aaron to walk around the altar, thus indicating a time factor. The next verse describes the *turning* of the fat and liver, etc., *into smoke*. After the act of pouring out the blood and the act of burning it might have required some time before the ritual could continue, since the burning of these parts must have taken time. The next Perf. form concerns the *burning up* of the flesh and the skin outside the camp. This is both a change of setting (away from the Tabernacle to the outside of the camp) and a pause in action (since it might have taken some time to take the carcass and the hide and burn it outside the camp). The final Perf. form refers to the *raising* of the breast and the right thigh as an elevation offering. It both signifies the end of that specific rite and a change of setting, since Lev 9,22 changes the ritual focus from the altar of the Tent of Meeting to the people. Other descriptive sections of previously prescribed actions can be found in Exod 35-40 and are predominantly concerned with the construction of the Tent of Meeting and its utensils⁽⁵⁵⁾. They differ significantly in their focus and their structure and thus cannot be used as comparative evidence.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Lev 10 describes the deaths of Nadab and Abihu as a consequence of their using a "strange fire". This is definitely a narrative section, and it contains few descriptions of actual ritual performance, the exception being 10,1. The other narrative section is found in Lev 24,10-23 concerning the stoning of a blasphemer. This pericope does not contain ritual performance material.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Exod 35,20-29, for example, contains the description of the actual gathering of the materials to be used for the Tabernacle (Exod 35,4-19 consists of the prescription of this action). Most verbal forms used there are Perf. forms — predominantly from the root בָּוֵא mostly in the Hi. This departs from the established pattern as found in Lev 8 and 9 where *wayyqtl* forms are predominantly used. The difference should be explained in terms of the different subject matter of the chapters. While Exod 35 is concerned with holy matters (in terms of ritual holiness), namely the construction of the Tent of Meeting, it does not involve actual ritual performance, but rather building instructions. This is also underlined by the predominant usage of the verbal root בָּוֵא with only slight variations. The section contains mainly a list of items brought to be used for the building of the Tabernacle. Lev 8 and 9, on the other hand, involve actual ritual performance — including offering sacrifices (as prescribed in Lev 1-7) and special ordination rites.

In view of the close relationship between language and action, it may be argued that the indication of succession in the text indicates also a succession of actual ritual performance. If one accepts the suggestion regarding the Perf. forms appearing in the central section of the three sacrificial offerings as indicating either a pause in the performance (or a change of location and thus of ritual focus) or a parallel performance of specific acts, one could chart an outline of the ritual performance of Lev 8 as follows⁽⁵⁶⁾:

Figure 2: Sequence of events of the ritual of ordination in Lev 8

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Preparations for ritual (2-4) | → Washing of Aaron and his sons (5-6) | → Clothing of Aaron (7-9) |
| Anointing of tabernacle (10-11) | → Anointing of Aaron (12) | → Clothing of Aaron's sons (13) |
| תִּמְחַת offering (14-17) | → עֹלֶה offering (18-21) | → מִלֵּאִים offering (22-29) |
| – pouring of blood – burning of carcass | – cutting of Ram – washing of entrails | – taking of bread |
| Anointing of Aaron and his sons with oil (30) | → Final instructions (31-36) | |

In view of the above mentioned arguments, the sequence of events of the ritual of ordination appears to follow a successive model with several threads of parallel actions regarding the sacrificial offerings.

* * *

Lev 8 exhibits a strong chiasmic pattern — including an “inner-chiasmic” structure which refers to smaller literary units containing concentric chiasmic designs. This chiasm points to the sacrificial service as the focal point of reference based upon its central position in the over-all structure. The evaluation of the differing aspects of the *wayyqtl* forms found in Lev 8 provides the following information: The predominant aspect of the *wayyqtl* forms indicates succession while there are ca. 8% of the forms which could be interpreted in terms of epexegetis. In view of the close relationship between language and action, it can be argued that the indication of succession in the text also indicates succession of actual ritual performance. The Perf. forms that can be found interspersed in the center of the chiasm of Lev 8 seem to indicate either parallel performance or a pause in ritual performance (or possibly a combination of both).

Universidad Peruana Unión
Facultad de Teología
Casilla 3564, Lima 100 Peru

Gerald A. KLINGBEIL

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Only the main blocks of action will be indicated. The smaller organizational blocks of action under the respective sacrifices represent parallel action.

The Hero as Bloody Bridegroom: On the Meaning and Origin of Exodus 4,26

In his recent article⁽¹⁾, W.H. Propp has convincingly shown that an ambiguous and controverted passage known as the “bloody bridegroom episode” (Exod 4,24-26) was produced by an interplay of three motifs — those of murder, circumcision and marriage — against the background of the Passover story in Exod 11–12. However, the *Sitz im Leben* of this interplay seems to be somewhat different from that reconstructed by Propp. According to him, Exod 4,24-26 reflect the transition from pre-nuptial circumcision to circumcision of infants. This point appears to be somewhat weak. Pre-nuptial circumcision is never mentioned or hinted at in the OT (the example of Shechem in Gen 34,14-17 misses the point, for here we deal with conversion), while Arabic and especially Australian parallels provide only indirect evidence⁽²⁾. One may also wonder whether *ḥātan dāmīm* was ever used to designate a freshly circumcised bridegroom: while the plural of *dām* ‘blood’ could have different meanings, describing, *inter alia*, the blood of childbirth and menstruation (though not of circumcision), with a noun standing in construct to it and denoting a person or a group of people *dāmīm* never implies anything but his or their evil deeds or intentions (cf. *’iš (ha)-dāmīm* in 2 Sam 17,7-8; Ps 5,7; *’ānšē dāmīm* in Ps 26,39; 55,24; 59,3; 139,19; Prov 29,10; *bēt ha-dāmīm* in 2 Sam 21,1, *’ir dāmīm* in Ezek 22,2; 26,6,9; Nah 3,1)⁽³⁾. It means that *ḥātan dāmīm* is most probably to be rendered “bridegroom deserving death for a first-degree murder”⁽⁴⁾, not “in-law protected by blood-vengeance”⁽⁵⁾. Finally, Propp’s hypothesis does not provide a *raison d’être* for Zipporah’s obscure concluding remark “*ḥātan dāmīm lammūlōt*” (Exod 4,26). If *ḥātan dāmīm* in any case stood for a newly circumcised male — be that an adolescent or an infant — an addition of the word *mūlōt*, ‘circumcisions’⁽⁶⁾ would be tautological and v. 26 (excluding the first two words) superfluous⁽⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁾ W.H. PROPP, “That Bloody Bridegroom (Exodus IV 24-6)”, *VT* 43 (1993) 495-518.

⁽²⁾ For a criticism of attempts to find parallels to *ḥātan dāmīm* in Arabic see M. GREENBERG, *Understanding Exodus* (New York 1969) 114; B.S. CHILDS, *The Book of Exodus* (OTL 2; Philadelphia 1975) 97-98.

⁽³⁾ On *’ānšē dāmīm* see N.A. UCHELEN, “*’ānšē dāmīm* in Psalms”, *OTS* 15 (1969) 205-212.

⁽⁴⁾ This translation is given by Onqelos.

⁽⁵⁾ So PROPP, “That Bloody Bridegroom”, 509. Blood-vengeance by in-laws is not registered in the OT: see R. DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (London 1965) 11-12.

⁽⁶⁾ For a discussion of this unique expression see *infra*.

⁽⁷⁾ J. DE GROOT, “The Story of the Bloody Husband (Exodus IV 24-26)”, *OTS* 2 (1943) 14, points out formal similarities between Exod 4,25-26 and 1 Sam 4,21-22. These similarities are indeed striking; however, it does not mean that both cases of alleged textual redundancy or one of them should be left unexplained.

Following Propp and many others, I believe that the author of Exod 4,24-26 “wished to explain a fossilized expression”⁽⁸⁾; but in my opinion this expression is *ḥātan dāmîm lammûlôt* rather than *ḥātan dāmîm*. As the proposed explanation is doubtlessly fictional we may try to figure out the original meaning of the phrase. It apparently contains three semantic elements:

A. *ḥātan*, ‘bridegroom’ (cf. Isa 61,10; 62,5; Jer 7,34; 16,9; 25,10; 33,11; Joel 2,16; Ps 19,6) or ‘son-in-law’ (as in Gen 19,12.14; Judg 16,6; 19,5; 1 Sam 18,18; 22,14; Neh 6,18; 13,28). Only in one case (2 Kgs 8,27) *ḥātan* probably (thought not necessarily) denotes a relative other than son-in-law.

B. *dāmîm*, ‘blood’, here implying a criminal act or intention (see *supra*).

C. *mûlôt*, ‘circumcisions’. Propp tentatively regards this *hapax legomenon* as a plural of abstraction and recommends to render it “the act of circumcision”⁽⁹⁾. As this view is not corroborated by any evidence, it is preferable to regard *mûlôt* as a standard plural of **mûlah*, ‘circumcision’. In other words, C is a series of circumcisions and not circumcision in general.

It goes without saying that whatever phenomenon or episode is mirrored by the expression in question, it should contain a combination of the same three elements. Is it possible to detect such a combination in the Bible?

A is explicitly coupled with C only once, in 1 Sam 18,20-27: a mass circumcision of Philistines makes David a bridegroom and a son-in-law:

And Saul said [to his servants], Thus shall you say to David, The king desires no dowry, but a hundred foreskins of the Philistines... And when his servants told David these words, it pleased David well to be the king’s son-in-law. Now, before the days were expired, David arose and went, he and his men, and slew of the Philistines two hundred men; and David brought their foreskins, and they gave them in full number to the king, that the he might be the king’s son-in-law. And Saul gave him Michal his daughter to wife.

B seems to be missing here: the author(s) of the cited text never drop(s) a hint that David’s foreskin-hunt, however extravagant, was, from the legal point of view, a murder⁽¹⁰⁾. But beyond the narrow limits of this episode the missing element may be found without difficulty: in 2 Sam 16,7-8 Shimei, son of Gera, twice calls David *’îš (ha)-dāmîm*, ‘blood-guilty one’, upon

⁽⁸⁾ PROPP, “That Bloody Bridegroom”, 508.

⁽⁹⁾ PROPP, “That Bloody Bridegroom”, 497, n. 14.

⁽¹⁰⁾ One cannot even be sure that the Philistines were actually murdered: the verb *yak* in v. 27 is ambiguous and may be translated both “killed” (as in Exod 2,12) and “defeated” (as in Judg 3,13). As two hundred Philistines are involved here (at least according to the MT), while the required bride-price did not exceed one hundred foreskins (in 2 Sam 3,14 David plainly states that he betrothed Michal “for a hundred foreskins”), we may suppose that David and his men did not hunt Philistines one by one but rather defeated a detachment of two hundred warriors and had half of them circumcised.

whom “Yhwh has returned... all the blood of the house of Saul”⁽¹¹⁾. Taken together with 1 Sam 18,20-27, the Shimei incident shows that at least some contemporaries could use the phrase *ḥātan dāmīm lammūlōt* to describe David’s stormy relations with the house of Saul. Having performed a mass circumcision of Philistines (*mūlōt*), David became Saul’s son-in-law (*ḥātan*), but later committed a capital offence against the king or his family (Shimei’s accusation could concern David’s complicity in the murders of Abner and Ishboshet, his service in the Philistine army at the time of Saul’s defeat at Gilboa⁽¹²⁾ or both)⁽¹³⁾. That after Gilboa David was for surviving Saulids a “bloody in-law”, can hardly be doubted.

Thus, we may suppose that *ḥātan dāmīm lammūlōt*, ‘bloody bridegroom by circumcisions’, was originally a pejorative reference to David coined by his political adversaries⁽¹⁴⁾. As David’s vices were gradually forgotten or received lenient interpretation and he turned into a national hero, a model monarch against whom all subsequent kings of Israel and Judah were judged⁽¹⁵⁾, it became increasingly difficult to identify him with the proverbial “bloody bridegroom”. A new explanation of this expression was not long in appearing: it was found in the Passover story where elements B (violent death of first-born sons) and C (circumcision as a pass to the apotropaic Passover meal) are prominent. It is possible that an existing tradition was used: a narrative in which Moses’ uncircumcised son is attacked by Yhwh (who mistakes him for one of Egyptian first-born) but saved by his mother’s prompt action, could originally be an integral part of the Passover cycle⁽¹⁶⁾. In any case, the new explanation was, due to its origin, based on the motif of mortal threat to first-born sons (having nothing to do with the original meaning of the explained phrase). It was this motif that most probably prompted the author of the “bloody bridegroom” narrative (or, rather, of its final, literary version) to place it

⁽¹¹⁾ Note that all occurrences of *’iš/’ānšē dāmīm* in the OT, with the single exception of Prov 29,10, are directly or indirectly connected with David.

⁽¹²⁾ So P. K. McCARTER, “The Apology of David”, *JBL* 99 (1980) 500-501.

⁽¹³⁾ It is often supposed that David’s blood-guilt was connected with the execution of seven Saulids described in 2 Sam 21; but see S. FROLOV – V. OREL, “On the Meaning of 2 Sam 9,1”, *BN* 73 (1994) 31-32.

⁽¹⁴⁾ According to B. S. CHILDS and other scholars, the preposition *l*^e is used in the word *lammūlōt* in the sense of “in reference to” (CHILDS, *The Book of Exodus*, 100; cf. J. I. DURHAM, *Exodus* [WBC 3; Waco 1987] 52). But the resulting translation of Exod 4,26b “at that time [or: at that point] she had said ‘blood bridegroom’ in reference to circumcision” is unacceptable since the formula was not pronounced on any other occasion. It seems more probable that the author had Zipporah say “the bridegroom of blood by circumcision” in order to demonstrate that the expression he had sought to explain brings together verbal and practical aspects of the rite described in vv. 24-25. According to GKC (§129), *l*^e may be used to introduce *genetivus auctoris*.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf., e.g., 1 Kgs 9,4; 14,8; 2 Kgs 14,3; 16,2; 18,3.

⁽¹⁶⁾ In spite of PROPP, “That Bloody Bridegroom”, 499, I am inclined to think that ambiguous masculine pronouns in Exod 4,24-26 refer to Zipporah’s son. Note that in the received text the last two masculine nouns preceding Exod 4,24 are *binkā b’kōrēkā*, ‘your first-born son’.

after Exod 4,23 where Yhwh promises to kill Pharaoh's heir⁽¹⁷⁾. What had formerly been a formidable invective, became a minor and harmless, if somewhat intriguing, detail of Moses' biography and was immortalized as such⁽¹⁸⁾.

Society for Research on Jewish Communities
Sprinzak Building
Givat-Ram
P.O.B. 4140 Jerusalem 91041

Serge FROLOV

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. R. G. HALL, "Circumcision", *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York 1992) II, 1027.

⁽¹⁸⁾ It is possible that re-interpretation of *ḥātan dāmīm lammūlōt* was deliberate and politically motivated: being aware of the real meaning of this expression, court scribes of Davidide kings could seek to neutralize it.

Heeding the Received Text: Jer 2,20a, A Case in Point

Although modern translations of the book of Jeremiah present a clear and apparently undisputed version of Jer 2,20, the meaning of this verse is not as transparent as the reader would be led to believe. A simple comparison of the *NRSV* with the *KJV* reveals two very different understandings of the opening half verse, neither of which accurately reflects the MT. The *NRSV* makes a change in the first line, the *KJV* in the last.

The *NRSV* represents the most common reading of Jer 2,20a⁽¹⁾:

For long ago you broke your yoke
and burst your bonds
and you said, "I will not serve!"

The *KJV*, on the other hand, gives a different interpretation of Jer 2,20a⁽²⁾:

For of old time I have broken thy yoke.
and burst thy bands;
and thou saidst, I will not transgress.

The differences are twofold. The first is how the versions understand who broke the yoke which Israel bore: Israel herself? or YHWH? The second difference concerns the words spoken by Israel to God. Were they a refusal to follow? or a promise to obey? In the final analysis, the issue revolves around how to construe the subject of the first two versets⁽³⁾, how to construe the subject of שברתי and נזקתי.

According to the *NRSV*, *Israel* broke the yoke of Torah which YHWH had imposed on the people. By rendering the first two verbs as second person feminine singular, with Israel (understood) as subject, the translators have made Israel's sinfulness the single focus. The *KJV*, by construing the first two verbs as first person singular (with God as subject), gives a different picture. It asserts that *YHWH* broke the yoke, not of Torah, but of slavery, most likely that which Egypt had imposed on the Israelites⁽⁴⁾, and so alludes to the exodus, with its accent on God's care for the people.

(¹) The interpretation found in the *NRSV* reflects the common understanding of the text as found in modern translations in English (*RSV*, *NAB*, *NEB*, *REB*, *JPS*), French (*TOB*, *JB*, Maredsous), German (*Echter Bibel*, *Die Bibel* [Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1993]), Italian (*CEI*), and Spanish (*Nueva Biblia Española*).

(²) The translations of G. LAMSA, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Near Eastern Manuscripts, Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta, the Authorized Bible of the East* (Philadelphia 1957) and A. CHOURAQUI, *La Bible* (Paris 1976) agree with the *KJV*.

(³) I am using this term following B. HRUSHOVSKI, "Prosody, Hebrew", *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 13 (Jerusalem 1971-72) 1200-1202, and R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York 1984) 9, to designate line-halves or line-thirds.

(⁴) Although מִצְרַיִם nowhere in the MT explicitly refers to the exodus event, it does not preclude that interpretation. According to HALAT III, 755, s.v. צוּרִים 3.;

Both readings are consonant with the prophet's challenge to the people of God that they acknowledge their guilt and take responsibility for their own fate. The *NRSV* does this by giving an example of their sins. The *KJV* assigns guilt indirectly by reference to a time when Israel rejected sin.

Interestingly, while both versions of Jer 2,20a reflect one aspect of Jeremiah as a whole, neither version accurately represents the pointed Hebrew of the MT:

כִּי מֵעוֹלָם שָׁבַרְתִּי עֲלֶיךָ וְתַקֵּיתִי מוֹסְרֶיךָ וְתֹאמְרִי לֹא אֶעֱבֹד

which says literally:

Indeed from of old I have broken your yoke,
I have snapped your bonds;
but you said "I will not serve" (6).

Thus understood, the Hebrew text emphatically contrasts YHWH's care for the people with Israel's rejection of the saving and liberating God. Such a translation fits the context as much as the *NRSV* and *KJV* renderings of these words and, moreover, reflects several common figures of Hebrew poetry, to wit, both synonymous parallelism and antithesis. It seems rather astounding, therefore, that hardly a commentary or a translation so much as alludes to this possibility, even in a footnote.

Following the insight of F. C. Cook, a nineteenth-century scholar, that "if... we understand yoke and bonds as referring to the slavery of Egypt from which Jehovah freed Israel, the first person... gives good sense [for Jer 2,20a]" (6), we should question whether the understanding of the text proposed by modern versions is the best one or whether a closer consideration of the poetry of Jer 2,20 might suggest other solutions to what has been a long-standing problem (7).

Modern commentators are unanimous in understanding Jer 2,20a as a double indictment of Israel (like the *NRSV*), all following the suggestion made by the editors of *BHK* and *BHS* (8).

E. JENNI, *THAT* II, 230-232, s.v. עוֹלָם; N. H. SNAITH, "Time in the Old Testament", *Promise and Fulfillment. Essays Presented to Professor S. H. Hooke in Celebration of His Ninetieth Birthday* (ed. F. F. BRUCE) (Edinburgh 1963) 180; מֵעוֹלָם can have a temporal referent, meaning a moment in the distant past. In this case the normal sense of separation carried by מֵן is lost and the phrase comes to mean "in former time" (BDB 581b, s.v. מֵן 4.c.). Since the exodus experience was the originating moment for the Hebrew people, it would make sense that here the referent is the moment when God first broke Israel's yoke of slavery, i.e., the exodus from Egypt.

(6) My translation of the MT.

(6) F. C. COOK, ed., *The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611)* (London 1875) 337.

(7) The Vulgate attests to this problem by its interpretive translation: *a saeculo confregisti iugum meum / rupisti vincula mea / et dixisti non serviam* which identifies the yoke and the bonds as those of YHWH. See *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, Tomus II (Stuttgart 1975).

(8) See E. ROSENMÜLLER, *Ieremiae Vaticinia et Threne I* (Scholia in Vetus Testamentum VIII; Lipsiae 1810-1835); B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jeremia* (HKAT 11; Tübingen 1901); F. GIESEBRECHT, *Das Buch Jeremia* (HKAT III/2/1; Göttingen 1907); P. VOLZ, *Der Prophet Jeremia* (KAT 10; Hildesheim 1983; reprint of 1928 edition); F. NÖTSCHER, *Das Buch Jeremias* (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments

The most common reason given for reading the MT in this way is that the text as pointed does not fit its literary context. This judgment is based on (1) the understanding of how the particle **כי** might be construed and on (2) **על** understood as a metaphor for Torah. The argument is further supported by the fact that (3) the archaic second person feminine singular **qal** perfect has the same consonantal form as the first person singular (attested in Jer 2,33; 3,4.5) and by (4) the LXX rendering of this line. Underlying all these reasons is (5) the unexpressed supposition that synonymous parallelism is the lynchpin of Hebrew poetry. Each of these assumptions will be examined in turn to determine their cogency in support of the argument that the MT of Jer 2,20a, as pointed, does not fit its literary context.

1. *The Particle כי*

Scholars who argue that the context requires Israel to be the subject of the verbs and, therefore, that **שברתי** and **נחתי** be second feminine singular, base their decision, at least in part, on how they understand the function of **כי**.

Jer 2,20a and 2,20b both open with the particle **כי**. Although the second **כי** is clearly a causal conjunction meaning "for", the interpretation of the first is less immediately obvious. While the standard translation is "for", Holladay makes the observation that since 2,19 concludes the whole of 2,14-19, and consequently 2,20 stands apart from the preceding verses, the **כי** which opens 2,20a cannot mean "for" ⁽⁹⁾.

Yet the *NRSV*, along with most modern versions, translating the **כי** of 2,20a with "for", maintains a long tradition which requires repointing the MT. This position is argued with great clarity by Giesebrecht ⁽¹⁰⁾, who begins with the assumption that the **כי** of Jer 2,20a does not differ in meaning from that of 2,20b. If the **כי** in 2,20a is translated "for", this would require that Jer 2,20a be understood to introduce an explanation of 2,19, an unequivocal declaration of Israel's apostasy. Giesebrecht draws a sound conclusion from his interpretation of **כי**: to read **שברתי** and **נחתי** of 2,20a as first singular would be to say that God's liberation of the people from slavery in Egypt (as expressed in 2,20a) was the foundation for their sin mentioned in the previous verse. This is logically impossible. If, however, **שברתי** and **נחתי** are construed as second feminine singular,

VII.2; Bonn 1934); A. CONDAMIN, *Le livre de Jérémie* (Études bibliques; Paris 1936); W. RUDOLPH, *Jeremia* (HAT 12; Tübingen ²1958) [The 3rd edition was unavailable to me]; A. WEISER, *Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia, Kapitel 1-25,14* (ATD 20; 4., neuarbeitete Auflage; Göttingen 1960); W. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1986); R. CARROLL, *Jeremiah* (Old Testament Library; London 1986); W. MCKANE, *Jeremiah i-xxv* (ICC; Edinburgh 1986). J. BRIGHT, *Jeremiah* (AB 21; Garden City, NY 1965) gives no indication that his translation of Jer 2,20a differs in any way from the MT.

⁽⁹⁾ HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, 97.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Since GIESEBRECHT, *Das Buch Jeremia*, 10-11, is the only commentator who gives well-developed reasons for his reading of Jer 2,20a, it is with his argumentation that I primarily engage.

2,20a would be a lament concerning the people's long-standing apostasy. In this case, it is easy to see how the message of 2,20a (lament over sinfulness) could flow from the accusation in 2,19⁽¹¹⁾. If one assumes, with Giesebrecht, that כִּי introduces an explanation of Jer 2,19, the only possible way to make sense of 2,20a is to read the first two verbs as second feminine singular and render the verse as an indictment of Israel.

Giesebrecht fails to note (and many others fail to mention), however, that כִּי can be translated in a great variety of ways⁽¹²⁾. Besides being a conjunction, it is also an emphatic particle⁽¹³⁾. While most lexica and grammars list this in second place⁽¹⁴⁾, *HALAT* gives prominence to כִּי as emphatic by first defining it as a demonstrative particle which is "emphatic, deictic and stressing", and then listing its other meanings⁽¹⁵⁾. *HALAT* thus reflects the original demonstrative character of כִּי, the fact that it points forward and emphasizes the following statement. This phenomenon can be observed in Jer 30,5.12; 31,6.19, where כִּי is found at the beginning of a line or pericope which has no explicit causal connection with what precedes or follows.

Interpreting כִּי as an emphatic particle erodes Giesebrecht's argument for emending 2,20a and brings into question the limits which context places on the interpretation of שְׁבַרְתִּי and נִתְקַחִי. Clearly, if כִּי is understood to mean "indeed" (emphatic) rather than the commonly found "for" (explanatory), the first two verbs of 2,20a could easily be in the mouth of YHWH.

2. Referent of the Metaphor עֹל

Another unspoken assumption in the decision to read Jer 2,20aαβ with second person feminine singular verbs is that עֹל (yoke) refers to the burden of the law. That עֹל means "yoke" is undisputed. It appears in its literal sense only three times in the MT (Num 19,2; Deut 21,3; 1 Sam 6,7), where it refers to the yoke used to harness an animal for work.

⁽¹¹⁾ GIESEBRECHT, *Das Buch Jeremia*, 10.

⁽¹²⁾ See J. MUILENBURG, "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle כִּי in the Old Testament", *HUCA* 32 (1961) 135-160 and A. SCHOORS, "The ticle כִּי", *Remembering All the Way...* (OTS 21; Leiden 1981) 240-276.

⁽¹³⁾ SCHOORS, "The Particle כִּי", upholds the pre-eminently emphatic function of כִּי. A. AEJMELAEUS, "Function and Interpretation of כִּי in Biblical Hebrew", *JBL* 105 (1986) 193-209, maintains, against the scholarly consensus, that כִּי functions primarily as a conjunction joining clauses to one another. Even if this were true in general, it would be difficult to defend for Jer 2,20a.

⁽¹⁴⁾ BDB does not give high profile to the statement that "there seem also to be other cases in which כִּי, standing alone, has an intensive force, introducing a statement with emph., *yea, surely, certainly*" (BDB 472b, s.v. כִּי, 1.e.). Although he appears to question the emphatic use of כִּי except in a few specific circumstances, P. JOÜON, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome 1923), does say that "כִּי est parfois employé pour renforcer légèrement l'affirmation: il a la valeur d'un *certes, oui* faible..." (Joüon §164b). Similarly, Gesenius says that "a weaker form of exclamation is sometimes produced by the insertion of a corroborative כִּי *verily, surely, before the predicate...*" (GKC §148d).

⁽¹⁵⁾ *HALAT*, 470, s.v. כִּי, A.1.

By far the most common biblical use of עַל is metaphorical. Thirty times it is an image for oppression. Once, in the Jacob cycle, it refers to the tyranny of one's brother (Gen 27,40). Most often, "yoke" pertains to the burden imposed by a ruler, whether the Israelite king (1 Kgs 12,4.9.10.11.14; 2 Chr 10,4.9.10.11.14) or a foreign despot (Egyptian - Lev 26,13; Assyrian - Isa 14,25; 47,6; Babylonian - Jer 27,8.11.12; 28,2.4.11.14; unnamed - Deut 28,48; Isa 9,3; 10,27; Jer 30,8; Ezek 34,27; Hos 11,4; Lam 1,14).

Holladay cites Jer 5,5 in support of construing עַל in Jer 2,20a as the burden of the law⁽¹⁶⁾. Even though Jer 2,20a; 5,5 and 30,8 all use the same stereotypical expression, Jer 5,5 is the only biblical verse in which עַל unequivocally means the burden of the Torah, with the people considering the law more oppressive than liberating. Although Schmoldt regards עַל of Jer 2,20a; 5,5 and Lam 3,27 as having the same tenor⁽¹⁷⁾, in Lam 3,27 the referent of עַל is unclear; it could refer to educative hardship (including the law) or to oppression.

Thus, while it is possible that עַל in Jer 2,20a means Torah, as modern translations imply, such an interpretation is not incontestable. Quite simply, the underlying significance of עַל is determined by how one chooses to understand the first two verbs of 2,20a. If they are read as received, as first person singular, with YHWH as subject, then עַל retains its usual metaphorical sense: the yoke of slavery, imposed on the people by a malevolent authority, a yoke which YHWH alone shattered.

3. Archaic Second Feminine Singular

By far the the strongest argument in favor of reading both שָׁבַרְתִּי and נָקַחְתִּי as second feminine singular is the well-attested fact that in their consonantal form these verbs could be either first singular or the archaic second feminine singular of the qal perfect⁽¹⁸⁾. Certainly the widely held interpretation of שָׁבַרְתִּי and נָקַחְתִּי as the archaic second feminine singular is not without foundation. Both the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Kethibh-Qere (KQ) of the MT give evidence of this form. The Samaritan Pentateuch consistently uses תִּי- as the second feminine singular ending of the perfect⁽¹⁹⁾. Furthermore, there are sixteen instances of the archaic form unambiguously attested by a KQ⁽²⁰⁾.

⁽¹⁶⁾ HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah* 1, 97.

⁽¹⁷⁾ H. SCHMOLDT, *TWAT* VI, 83, s.v. עַל, considers not only Jer 5,5 but also Jer 2,20 and Lam 3,27 as referring to the burden of the law.

⁽¹⁸⁾ GKC §44h; Joüon §42f; H. BAUER-P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testament* (Hildesheim 1962, reprint of 1922 edition) §42k-l. This archaic ending consistently appears when the 2f.s. has a pronominal suffix attached.

⁽¹⁹⁾ A. SPERBER, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions for Their Solutions* (Leiden 1966) 233.

⁽²⁰⁾ Jer 2,33; 3,4.5; 4,19; 22,23 (2x); 31,21; 46,11; Ezek 16,13.20.22.31.43; Ru 3,3.4. See SPERBER, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 236-237.

It is perfectly logical and in line with the diction of the book as a whole (with the feminine form frequently used to address Israel) that the first two verbs of 2,20a be read “you broke... you burst...”. *BHS* justifies this reading by reference to Jer 2,33, which, like Jer 3,4.5; 4,19; and 31,21, has an archaic second feminine singular, indicated by the Qere. In each of these five instances, although the consonantal text suggests a first singular (ח-), the pointing, which follows the marginal note, is clearly second feminine singular (חָ-).

Despite the singularity between Jer 2,20a and 2,33, etc., there is also a striking difference. While the verb in question in Jer 2,33; 3,4.5; 4,19 and 31,21 in each instance has a Qere ח- (vocalized accordingly as a second feminine singular) for Kethibh ח- (first singular), this is not the case for 2,20. The sole KQ in Jer 2,20a addresses a different issue, which means the (pointed) MT of 2,20aαβ is not disputed in the received text.

Each of the three verses of Jer most commonly used to justify the emendation of Jer 2,20a (2,33; 3,4.5) is pointed to agree with its Qere. Therefore, it is easy to conclude that if Jer 2,20a should be read as second feminine singular, the Masoretes would have inserted a marginal note to this effect. Yet a consideration of the relative importance of the Kethibh and the Qere calls into question this apparently facile solution to the problem.

According to Robert Gordis, contrary to the widely held opinion that the Qere, as a correction of the Kethibh, is to be favored, “the Qere is superior to the Kethibh in only 18% of the cases while the Kethibh is superior to the Qere in 12%. In the remaining 62% [*sic*] of the instances they are of equal value”⁽²¹⁾. This reflects the interest of the Masoretes which was to conserve the text, including the transmission of divergent readings⁽²²⁾, rather than emend it.

While transmitting and conserving different readings, the Masoretes also sought to guard against potential problems in reading the Hebrew text, much beyond correcting an erroneous expression. In fact, the single most common KQ is linked with the Tetragrammaton, where it directs the reader to refrain from pronouncing the name of the deity and so to avoid blasphemy. A second common Qere substituted a euphemism for an offensive term to encourage readers to avoid indecent expressions⁽²³⁾. Yet another reason for KQ was to fix pronunciation where it might be unclear or disputed⁽²⁴⁾, though there is disagreement whether this feature appeared before the invention of the vocalic system or after it⁽²⁵⁾.

⁽²¹⁾ R. GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making. A Study of the Kethib-Qere*, Augmented Edition (New York 1971) xvi.

⁽²²⁾ GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making*, 48. This notion of KQ preserving divergent readings has been reinforced and taken a step further by B. COSTACURTA, “Implicazioni semantiche in alcuni casi di *Qere-Kethib*”, *Bib* 71 (1990) 226-239.

⁽²³⁾ GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making*, 29-31.

⁽²⁴⁾ GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making*, 35-39.

⁽²⁵⁾ Both GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making*, 31, and E. J. REVELL, editor's note in I. YEIVEN, *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah*, translated and edited by E. J. Revell (Masoretic Studies 5; Missoula 1980) 59 hold the former. However, YEIVEN himself (*Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah*, 59) opts for the latter.

Most surprising is that, although they are common, the guides to reading as given in the Qere were not done with any great degree of consistency. While “a sort of updating of the spelling conventions was one major element of the KQ system”, there are clearly several texts where a KQ might be expected but is not found, which illustrates that KQ was not done systematically⁽²⁶⁾. Thus the lack of a Qere for Jer 2,20a is not in itself a sufficient reason for favoring the MT as pointed.

It is not impossible that the archaic second feminine singular should be read despite the lack of any Qere to this effect. In fact Robert Gordis proposes that Jer 2,20a, along with Judg 5,7 and Mic 4,13, fits this category⁽²⁷⁾. The want of a Qere could be explained by the fact that no variants existed in manuscripts other than the “prototype”⁽²⁸⁾.

4. *The LXX*

If the absence of a Qere is not sufficient reason to justify reading the MT as pointed, one might be inclined to correct 2,20a by appealing to the LXX which construes the first two verbs (נָתַתִּי and שָׁבַרְתִּי) with a second person feminine subject (“you” referring to sinful Israel):

ὅτι ἅπ' αἰῶνος συνέτριψας τὸν ζυγὸν σου,
διέσπασας τοὺς δεσμούς σου
καὶ εἶπας Οὐ δουλεύσω⁽²⁹⁾.

While appealing to the LXX as the basis for correcting the MT is a questionable practice for any book of the Hebrew Bible⁽³⁰⁾, it is particularly problematic for Jeremiah. Unlike most other books of the Hebrew Bible, the LXX of Jeremiah is considerably shorter than the MT and clearly represents a different text tradition⁽³¹⁾. Since for Jeremiah the

⁽²⁶⁾ J. BARR, “A New Look at the Kethibh-Qere”, *Remembering All the Way* ..., 33.

⁽²⁷⁾ A careful examination of these texts reveals that in neither instance is it certain that the verb in question must be a second feminine singular. Judg 5,7 is a difficult text which bears further study while Mic 4,13 could as easily be read with a first person singular.

⁽²⁸⁾ See GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making*, 102 and 173, n.122.

⁽²⁹⁾ J. ZEIGLER, *Septuaginta*, Vol. XV. *Ieremias. Baruch. Threni. Epistula Ieremiae* (Göttingen 1957).

⁽³⁰⁾ See, e.g., E. WÜRTHWEIN, *The Text of the Old Testament. An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*, translated by E. F. Rhodes (London 1980) 63-68. This is not to deny the fact that the LXX may be useful in determining the earliest text, as is demonstrated by Y. GOLDMAN, “Crispations théologiques et accidents textuels dans le TM de Jérémie 2”, *Bib* 76 (1995) 25-51.

⁽³¹⁾ See F. M. CROSS, “The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert”, *HTR* 57 (1964) 281-299; E. TOV, “L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie”, *RB* 79 (1972) 189-199; J. G. JANZEN, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM 4; Cambridge, MA 1973); E. TOV, “Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah”, *Le livre de Jérémie. Le Prophète et son milieu. Les oracles et leur transmission* (ed. P.-M. BOGAERT) (BETL 54; Leuven 1981) 145-167; P.-M. BOGAERT, “De Baruch à Jérémie. Les deux rédactions conservées du livre de Jérémie”, *ibid.* 168-173; *id.*, “Les mécanismes rédactionnels en Jér 10,1-10 (LXX et TM) et la

LXX is neither the proto-Masoretic text nor a later version of the MT, it hardly seems appropriate to support a text correction by reference to what is a different strand of the text, as both the editor of *BHS* and some contemporary exegetes appear to have done⁽³²⁾. It is more accurate to maintain that the MT, like the LXX and Targum Jonathan, had its own interests which are conveyed in the text as it was handed down.

Text correction, especially when based on the LXX, can be simply a convenient way to solve the problem of a difficult text. Hans Kosmala has cautioned against the temptation to manipulate the text, in noting that at times scholars are more interested in what a prophet "ought to have said and how the text, therefore, ought to be emended"⁽³³⁾ than in what the text actually does say. As one scholar from the last century put it in support of the MT of Jer 2,20a, "...if the Masorites [*sic*], who represent the traditional interpretation of the Jews in Palestine, had known of so simple a rendering [as that of the LXX and Vulgate] they would not have had recourse to so strong a measure as to change the reading [giving us the actual KQ]"⁽³⁴⁾.

Given the amazingly accurate transmission of Hebrew biblical texts, including even the preservation in the MT of "an ancient reliable tradition regarding the pronunciation of the biblical text"⁽³⁵⁾, any textual change should be done only if there are compelling reasons (one of which is the meaning of a word in its context) and only as a last resort.

But the question remains: Is it possible, short of re-pointing, to make sense of Jer 2,20a as it stands in the MT? In what follows I will show that a careful consideration of 2,20a as poetry offers a solution to this ancient problem.

5. *The Challenge of Hebrew Poetic Diction*

Poetic texts, by their very nature, use a language which embraces multivalence, ambiguity, metaphor, allusion and other forms of semantic plenitude. Their ability to reach beyond ordinary logical discourse with its limited powers of reference makes possible the communication of a wide range of ideas and experiences. It is thus important to consider poetic diction as a possible source of insights which can account for the MT of Jer 2,20a as it stands.

signification des suppléments", in *ibid.* 222-238; Y. GOLDMAN, *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie* (OBO 118; Freiburg-Göttingen 1992). GOLDMAN, "Crispations théologiques et accidents textuels", 24-25, n. 3, gives an exhaustive list of the literature on this topic.

⁽³²⁾ See, e.g., DUHM, *Das Buch Jeremia*, 24; GIESEBRECHT, *Das Buch Jeremia*, 10; HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, 52; CARROLL, *Jeremia*, 130. GOLDMAN, "Crispations théologiques et accidents textuels", 32-34, reads the two verbs as 2 f.s., with the LXX, basing his decision to a great extent on how the Qere of Jer 2,20a (read אַעֲבֹר for אַעֲבֹר) indicates a theological problem in the MT and on how the corrected MT fits its context.

⁽³³⁾ H. KOSMALA, "Form and Structure in Ancient Hebrew Poetry (A New Approach)", *VT* 14 (1964) 423. Although this critique is concerned with metre in Isaiah, the underlying insight is valid for other types of text emendation as well.

⁽³⁴⁾ COOK, ed., *The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version*, 337.

⁽³⁵⁾ GORDIS, *The Biblical Text in the Making*, xiv.

Hebrew Poetry and Synonymous Parallelism

No one contests that parallelism, be it grammatical (morphologic or syntactic), lexical, semantic or phonologic⁽³⁶⁾, is one of the earmarks of Hebrew poetry. Yet, despite the fact that since Lowth Hebrew poetry has been defined to include antithetic as well as synonymous and synthetic parallelism⁽³⁷⁾, many scholars who read the first two verbs of Jer 2,20 as second feminine singular appear to base their decision on the assumption that Hebrew poetry tends to develop in lines of synonymous semantic parallelism. Such a judgment, for example, implicitly informs C. J. Ball's comment in the *Expositor's Bible*: "The punctuators of the Hebrew text, having pointed the first two verbs as first person instead of second feminine, were *obliged*, further, to suggest reading פ' "br 'I will not transgress' for the original פ' "bd 'I will not serve' — a variant which is found in the Targum and many MSS editions" [emphasis added]⁽³⁸⁾.

To accept חִבְרִי and נִחְקִי as pointed (first singular) is to say that God removed the yoke of slavery from the neck of the Israelites, a perception reflected in both Targum Jonathan and the Peshitta. The only Qere, proposed by the MT for Jer 2,20 (read לֹא אֶעֱבֹר instead of עָשָׂה אֶעֱבֹר) and followed by the Peshitta and the Targum, makes the last phrase a logical consequence of the first. By suggesting this alternate reading, the Masoretes changed the third verset from an act of disobedience ("I will not serve") to a promise of fidelity ("I will not transgress" [2,20aγ]), an adequate response to YHWH's act of salvation (2,20aαβ). If the Masoretes understood Hebrew poetry to move forward in such a way that succeeding lines repeat or develop the previous statement, it readily follows that they could have understood the text to have לֹא אֶעֱבֹר ("I will not transgress") rather than the עָשָׂה אֶעֱבֹר ("I will not serve") they had received. (Confusion between ו and ד is a common error in the manuscripts.) While the suggestion that a specific understanding of Hebrew poetry informed some glosses or emendations is nowhere explicitly stated, it does give a logical explanation for changes such as the Qere of Jer 2,20a. Ball's assertion, that the Masoretes had an "obligation" to change the expression of 2,20aγ⁽³⁹⁾, reflects a view of Hebrew poetry as favoring synonymous or synthetic over antithetic parallelism. Even Targum Jonathan on Jeremiah appears to support this attitude.

The Targum on Jeremiah

While it is possible that the Qere (אֶעֱבֹר rather than עָשָׂה אֶעֱבֹר) reflects a conviction that Hebrew poetry proceeds in lines of synonymous or synthetic

⁽³⁶⁾ A. BERLIN, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington, IN 1985).

⁽³⁷⁾ See A. BAKER, "Parallelism: England's Contribution to Biblical Studies", *CBQ* 35 (1973) 429-440, for an excellent summary of how Lowth advanced the modern understanding of Hebrew poetry.

⁽³⁸⁾ C. J. BALL, *The Prophecies of Jeremiah* (*The Expositor's Bible*; New York 1903) 95. GOLDMAN, "Crispations théologiques et accidents textuels", 32-34, follows a similar line of reasoning.

⁽³⁹⁾ BALL, *The Prophecies of Jeremiah*, 95.

parallelism, it is also conceivable that the Targum has accepted this variant because of its own specific interests. Targum Jonathan's rendering of Jer 2,20 may be rooted in its penchant for paraphrasing the biblical text in order to accent reverence and respect both for the deity (e.g., eliminating anthropomorphisms) and for Israel (e.g., emphasizing that those who keep the law will receive a just reward)⁽⁴⁰⁾. This becomes evident in the fact that, although it follows the Qere, the Targum also makes specific what the MT had left to inference.

For from of old I have broken the yoke *of the nations from your neck*;
I have severed your chains;
and you said: "We will not again transgress *against your Memra*"⁽⁴¹⁾.

Whatever the particular interest of the Targum, the whole of Jer 2,20, according to this Targumic interpretation, moves in a single direction: the people responded positively to YHWH's initiative of freeing them from their enemies. Like the MT and the LXX, the Targum appears to reflect an underlying assumption that synonymous or at least synthetic parallelism is the basic form of Hebrew poetry.

Even though the contemporary interpretation, with its accent on Israel's sinfulness, is diametrically opposed in meaning to the Targum, contemporary translators and exegetes appear to embrace the same principle concerning Hebrew poetry with their attempt to maintain a single focus for the verse.

Beyond Synonymous Parallelism

Parallelism, though not held to be the unique defining principle of Hebrew poetry, is widely considered its most common characteristic⁽⁴²⁾.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ R. HAYWARD, *The Targum of Jeremiah, Translated, with a Critical Apparatus and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible 12; Wilmington 1987) 22-23.

⁽⁴¹⁾ This translation is taken from HAYWARD, *The Targum of Jeremiah*, 51. The Targumic glosses are italicized.

⁽⁴²⁾ A look at the table of contents of W.G.E. WATSON, *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse* (JSOTSS 170; Sheffield 1994) will bear this out. He devotes 209 pages (288 if we include the chapter on Chiasm) of a 478-page book to this topic. The recent *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D.N. FREEDMAN et al.) (New York 1992) under the entry "Poetry, Hebrew" refers the reader to three other entries, the one on "Parallelism" being the only one concerned directly with poetic technique or figures. (The other two are the entries on "Psalms" and on the "Buddie Hypothesis" which is concerned with the *qina* form.) See also L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (Subsidia Biblica 11; Rome 1988) 48; R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York 1984), especially Chapter 1: "The Dynamics of Parallelism".

This is not meant to minimize the impact of those scholars who have defined Hebrew poetry not by parallelism but in another way: accented syllables (WATSON, *Traditional Techniques of Classical Hebrew Verse*, 87-113); syllable count (D.N. FREEDMAN, "Prolegomenon to G.B. Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry*" in *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy. Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry* [Winona Lake 1980]); word-pairs (W. WATERS, *Formula Criticism and the Poetry of the Old Testament* [BZAW 138; Berlin-New York 1976]); syntax (T. COLLINS, *Line Forms in Hebrew Poetry. A Grammatical Approach to the Stylistic Study of the Hebrew Prophets* [Studia Pohl: Series Maior 7; Rome 1978]); M. O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Verse Structure*

Even if many scholars have written at length on the way parallelism functions in the structure, grammar or syntax of lines⁽⁴³⁾, to speak of parallelism without further qualification is generally to conjure up semantic similarity⁽⁴⁴⁾.

A glance at modern commentaries shows that this supposition underlies the interpretation of Jer 2,20. For example, Giesebrecht's decision to correct the pointed MT of Jer 2,20a presupposes the primacy of synonymous parallelism. He states that Israel's refusal to serve YHWH (Jer 2,20aγ) requires the second feminine singular in the opening line (Jer 2,20aaβ), since the latter would be another way of expressing the same sinfulness⁽⁴⁵⁾. Yet another reason he opts for the second feminine singular is to maintain a single subject for all the verbs in 2,20.

Giesebrecht does not stand alone in proposing that this verse must express one single concept, whether in synonymous or in synthetic parallelism. Although they are less explicit in their reasons for reading שְׁכַרְתִּי and נִחַקְתִּי as second feminine singular, both McKane⁽⁴⁶⁾ and Holladay⁽⁴⁷⁾ clearly choose to limit Jer 2,20 to a single idea, presented in synthetic parallelism. Their acceptance of the primacy of synonymous and synthetic parallelism is very evident since neither considers the opening כִּי to be explanatory, as do Duhm and Giesebrecht. Thus, even admitting that 2,20a opens a new section, they still feel compelled to reposit the MT and read the text as an accusation in two parts, with the people's sinful attitude expressed in both deed and word:

For long ago you broke your yoke,
you burst your bonds
and you said: "I will not serve!"

[Winona Lake 1980]]; colometry (W. CLOETE, *Versification and Syntax in Jeremiah* 2-25. *Syntactical Constraints in Hebrew Colometry* [Atlanta 1989]).

A good summary of the state of the question can be found in D.L. PETERSEN-K. H. RICHARDS, *Interpreting Biblical Poetry* (Guides to Biblical Scholarship; Minneapolis 1992).

⁽⁴³⁾ WATSON, *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse*, 26, gives an excellent overview in table form. See also, BERLIN, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ See, e.g., R. GORDIS, *Poets, Prophets, and Sages. Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (Bloomington, IN 1971) 61. In arguing against a simplistic understanding of parallelism, R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Poetry*, 9-11, indicates the currency of this concept. S. GELLER, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry* (HSM 20; Missoula 1979) 31-42, however, points out the difficulty encountered in attempts to define the relationships expressed by semantic parallelism.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ GIESEBRECHT, *Das Buch Jeremia*, 10.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ MCKANE, *Jeremiah i-xxv*, 40, simply says "the two verbs should be taken as 2nd person feminine singular".

⁽⁴⁷⁾ HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, 52, places the weight for his decision on the context and adds simply "(so G)". Yet on p. 70, in his discussion of 2,20-22, he considers these verses four tricola, each offering another metaphor for Israel as errant: a refractory animal (2,20a), a whore (2,20b), a vine gone bad (2,21), a person with bloodied hands (2,22). This gives implicit support to the importance of synonymous parallelism.

On every high hill
 and under every green tree
 you sprawled and played the whore. (Jer 2,20)

The Poetry of the MT

Since Jer 2,20a manifests semantic parallelism in two triadic⁽⁴⁸⁾ lines:

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| ותאמרי לא אעבד | נחתי מוסרתיך | כי מעולם שבארתי עלך |
| את צעה זונה | שתחת כל-עץ רענה | כי-על-כל גבעה |

Indeed long ago I broke your yoke,
 I burst your bonds
 but you said: "I will not serve!"

For on every high hill
 and under every green tree
 you sprawled and played the whore.

The insights of Hebrew poetic diction are foundational for any consideration of this text. Based on the above, it is easy to perceive the pattern

A / A' / B
 C / C' / B'

where the same letter indicates synonymous semantic parallelism. A and A' exemplify synonymy which appears to be little more than static repetition. A' ("I burst your bonds") simply repeats the idea of A ("I broke your yoke") in different words, expanding minimally on the first statement. C' ("under every green tree"), on the other hand, while expressing a physical location like its counterpart, both expands the information offered by C ("on every high hill") and makes it more precise. In a similar way B' ("you sprawl and play the whore") gives a specific example of the more general statement found in B ("you said 'I will not serve'"), indicating how the Israelites realized in deeds what they expressed in words. Thus both B//B' and C//C' represent expansion and intensification which are integral to the synonymous parallelism of the Hebrew Bible⁽⁴⁹⁾.

Although the two triadic lines of Jer 2,20a can be considered an example of synonymous parallelism, since both lines conclude on a similar note (B,B'), a detailed analysis of the verse gives evidence that, beyond the overall semantic parallelism, there is internal parallelism that is more complex than synonymy. While the first two versets of each line — A // A' ("I broke your yoke" // "I burst your bonds") and C // C' ("on every high hill" // "under every green tree") — manifest synonymous semantic parallelism, in each case the third — B // B' ("you said 'I will not serve'")

⁽⁴⁸⁾ This usage follows that of ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Poetry*, 9. W.G.E. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry. A Guide to Its Techniques* (JSOTSS 26; Sheffield 1984) 168-185, and others would identify as tricola what I call triadic lines.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ See, e.g., ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Poetry*, especially Chapter III: "Structures of Intensification".

“you sprawl and play the whore”) — stands apart from the first two, each in its own way. The third verset of the second line (“You sprawl and play the whore”) is the main clause, while the first two versets of that line act as adverbial modifiers. But the status of the first line (2,20a) is totally different, for the third verset (“you said: ‘I will not serve!’”) stands in stark contrast to the beginning of the line⁽⁵⁰⁾. The people’s refusal to obey (2,20a) is hardly the expected response to YHWH’s saving deed (2,20aaβ). Thus Jer 2,20a, in Hebrew poetic fashion, manifests parallelism, as one might expect, but antithetic rather than synonymous.

Antithesis in Hebrew Poetry

Contemporary biblical scholars have stressed antithesis as “one of the most important stylistic techniques” of Hebrew poetry⁽⁵¹⁾. It has been recognized as one of the marks which distinguish poetry from prose since “prose tends to sequential description of events and thus to synonymy, whereas poetry represents formulation of feelings and fundamental beliefs in dramatic or impressionistic expressions by means of parataxis and abrupt transitions, and consequently favors antithesis”⁽⁵²⁾. Thus the recognition of antithesis as an essential aspect of Hebrew poetry raises the question of whether Jer 2,20a must have a single linear focus, such that the whole verse must convey nothing but Israel’s sinfulness in a variety of images.

This question is supported further by the realization that antithesis of this type is found elsewhere in Jer 2,1–4,4. In 2,17, the prophet challenges the people to accept their responsibility for their fate by pointing to their rejection of the God who led them to freedom in their own land⁽⁵³⁾:

Have you not brought this upon yourself
by forsaking the Lord your God,
while he led you in the way? (Jer 2,17)

Or again, God seeks to understand how those who were initially a source of joy became the opposite:

Yet I planted you as a choice vine,
from the purest stock.
How then did you become degenerate
and become a wild vine? (Jer 2,21)

⁽⁵⁰⁾ This is a common function of the third verset in triadic lines, according to R. ALTER, *The World of Biblical Literature* (New York 1992) 177.

⁽⁵¹⁾ ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 85. While GORDIS, *Poets, Prophets and Sages*, 72 admits the significance of antithetic parallelism, he tends to limit its importance to Wisdom literature.

⁽⁵²⁾ A. KRAŠOVEC, *Antithetic Structure in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* (VTS 35; Leiden 1984) 140, n. 11.

⁽⁵³⁾ Most modern exegetes omit the last line of Jer 2,17 as dittography of the opening words of 2,18 (see DUHM, *Das Buch Jeremia*, 23; GIESEBRECHT, *Das Buch Jeremia*, 9; VOLZ, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, 15; RUDOLPH, *Jeremia*, 16; BRIGHT, *Jeremiah*, 9; MCKANE, *Jeremiah i-xxv*, 38). HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, 52, 95, reiterates the insight of CONDAMIN, *Le livre de Jérémie*, 15, that haplography in the LXX is as likely as dittography in the MT. Holladay also suggests that maintaining 2,17 as it stands in the MT is poetically and logically sound. Thus, despite dissenting voices, I stand with Holladay’s judgment in accepting the received text.

In each instance, the contrast found in an antithetical presentation strengthens the emotional impact of the line for the hearer and so responds to the poetic aesthetic of conveying meaning in ways that extend beyond simple logical statements.

If antithetical structure and ideas in poetry are indeed seminal to the genre, then the presence of antithesis in 2,20a, rather than simple synonymous repetition, would be more "poetic". Indeed 2,20a as antithesis plays up the stark contrast between God's loving activity and Israel's rejection of the caring deity. Such contrast serves to accentuate the sinfulness of the people in a way that synonymous repetition could never do. Israel's apostasy is all the more reprehensible when seen against the backdrop of YHWH's saving deed.

Conclusion

It thus becomes clear that the (pointed) MT of Jer 2,20 makes sense as it stands. To admit this, however, requires several changes in what underlies the accepted interpretation. The most fundamental shift is the acknowledgement that antithesis and antithetic parallelism are foundational to Hebrew poetry. This then opens the door to reconsider the grammatical constructions and the meaning of words. To construe the opening כִּי as emphatic ("indeed") rather than explanatory is another step to understanding שְׁכַרְחִי and נִחַקְחִי as first person singular, predicated of YHWH. All of these elements suggest the possibility of a "new" reading of Jer 2,20a, one which follows the pointed MT. Jer 2,20, as a whole, would then be rendered:

Indeed, from of old I have shattered your yoke
I have snapped your bonds
but you said: "I will not serve!"

For on every high hill
and under every green tree
you are bending down and playing the whole.

Such an interpretation accents the tension which exists in the relationship between YHWH and Israel. It underlines the fact that Israel broke the covenant which YHWH had established at the exodus and places the blame for the coming destruction squarely on Israel's shoulders. In this way Jer 2,20 summarizes the underlying theology of Jeremiah: even after experiencing YHWH's life-giving salvation, Israel has consistently refused to accept YHWH as her only God. She cannot, therefore, be surprised at the destruction of Jerusalem and the loss of the land.

This is but one small example of how a careful consideration of Hebrew poetic diction can uncover meaning that has remained hidden under years of interpretation. It also suggests one approach to expand and deepen our perception and appreciation of the semantic and theological richness of the Hebrew Bible.

Faculty of Theology
Saint Paul University
223 Main St.
Ottawa Ont. Canada K1S 1C4

Barbara A. BOZAK, CSJ

Ist Ps 29 die Bearbeitung eines Baal-Hymnus?

Die Frage, ob der Mittelteil von Ps 29, also Vv. 3-9, aus einem vormalig auf Baal gemünzten Text besteht, den der Psalmdichter bei der Komposition von Ps 29 übernommen und einfach den Namen Baals durch den Jahwes ersetzt hat, wurde bisher kontrovers diskutiert⁽¹⁾. Für die These der (polemischen?) Bearbeitung eines Baaltextes spricht die ugaritische Überlieferung von den sieben Donnerblitzen Baals (vgl. KTU 1.101⁽²⁾); von dieser Überlieferung her kann man schließen, daß durchaus ein (hymnischer?) Text die sieben Donner zum Gegenstand gehabt haben könnte. Gegen eine direkte Textbearbeitung wird — bisher — ins Feld geführt, daß man einen solchen Text, der unmittelbar Vorlage für Ps 29 gewesen sein könnte, in der Umwelt Israels nicht gefunden hat.

Ein neues motiv- bzw. traditionsgehistisches Argument kann hier vermutlich weiterführen.

In seinem Aufsatz *Zur Frage des Synkretismus im Alten Testament*⁽³⁾ erwähnt Stendebach, allerdings ohne Ps 29 im Auge zu haben: "Er [= Jahwe] ist im Gegensatz zu Baal auch der Herr der Wüste". Das ist mit Blick auf die Problematik von Ps 29 ein erstaunlicher Sachverhalt. In der Tat gibt es in den erhaltenen Zeugnissen über Baal keine Hinweise darauf, daß irgendwo Baal als Herr der Wüste thematisiert wird. Auch von seiner Funktion als Sturm-/Fruchtbarkeitsgott her spricht bei Baal nichts für eine Herrschaft über die Wüste. Und in der auffälligsten Parallele zu Ps 29, dem Text KTU 1.4 VII, fehlt die Wüstenmotivik ebenfalls. Jahwe wird dagegen durchaus als Herr über die Wüste geschildert, wie etwa Jes 41,18 u.ä. Stellen zeigen⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Zur neuesten Forschung zu Ps 29 vgl. bes. J. JEREMIAS, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen. Israels Begegnung mit dem kanaanäischen Mythos in den Jahwe-König-Psalmen* (FRLANT 141; Göttingen 1987); O. LORETZ, *Ugarit-Texte und Thronbesteigungspsalmen. Die Metamorphose des Regenspenders Baal-Jahwe* (UBL 7; erweiterte Neuauflage von *Psalm 29. Kanaanäische El- und Baaltraditionen in jüdischer Sicht* [UBL 2; Münster 1984]; Münster 1988). JEREMIAS, *Königtum Gottes*, 30 nennt als den Vertreter der Richtung, die von einem umgeprägten kanaanäischen Hymnus ausgeht, Ginsberg (H. L. GINSBERG, "A Phoenician Hymn in the Psalter", *Atti del XIX Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti, Roma 23-29 Settembre 1935* [Roma 1938] 472-476), als einen, der die Auffassung vertritt, es handle sich in Ps 29 um die Aufnahme kanaanäischer Ausdrucksweisen und Vorstellungen, Loretz (s. o.). Jeremias selber geht ebenfalls von einem vorgegebenen Baal-Hymnus aus, der am Beginn der Entstehungsgeschichte von Ps 29 steht (JEREMIAS, *Königtum Gottes*, 41-42).

⁽²⁾ Die ugaritischen Texte sind zitiert nach KTU: M. DIETRICH-O. LORETZ-J. SANMARTÍN, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit* (AOAT 24; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1976). Siehe jetzt auch: M. DIETRICH-O. LORETZ-J. SANMARTÍN, *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places* (ALASP 8; Münster 1995).

⁽³⁾ F. J. STENDEBACH, "Zur Frage des Synkretismus im Alten Testament", *Suchbewegungen. Synkretismus – Kulturelle Identität und kirchliches Bekenntnis* (Hrsg. H. P. VON SILLER) (Darmstadt 1991) 31-41.

⁽⁴⁾ STENDEBACH, "Zur Frage des Synkretismus", 37 denkt auch an Hos 2, 4-17.

Dieses auffällige Fehlen der Vorstellung von Baal als dem Herrn der Wüste muß aber dann bezüglich der These eines früher eigenständigen Baal-Hymnus als Vorlage für den Mittelteil von Ps 29 bedenklich stimmen. In Ps 29 kommt nämlich die Wüstenmotivik prononciert vor: sie nimmt in V. 8 einen ganzen Parallelismus ein und stellt somit eines der zentralen Motive des Mittelteils dar.

Eher als eine Übernahme bzw. Bearbeitung eines kompletten Textes ist daher vorstellbar, daß der Mittelteil in der israelitischen Komposition unter Rückgriff auf vorliegende kanaanäische (und israelitische) Traditionselemente (und nicht Texte) komponiert wurde, z. B. auf Motive, die sonst mit Baal/Hadad verbunden waren: Donner, Blitz, Beben etc. (vgl. KTU 1.101; KTU 1.4 V; KTU 1.4 VII). Daß bei dieser Komposition das Siebener-Schema der sieben Donner Baals eine Rolle gespielt hat, ja vielleicht sogar leitend war, spricht nicht gegen diese These; das Schema dürfte in Form der sieben Mal auftauchenden "Stimme Jahwes" als ein (baubestimmendes) Element in Psalm 29 übernommen worden sein⁽⁶⁾. Die Ausführung ist allerdings mit Motiven angereichert, die sich, wie gesagt, Baal sonst kaum zuschreiben lassen, so daß mit einer direkten Übernahme eines *Textes* nicht zu rechnen ist.

Damit läge auf der inhaltlichen Ebene, was die Gestaltung des Mittelteils anbelangt, ein vergleichbarer Sachverhalt vor, wie er auch für den gesamten Psalm unter Einfluß des Einleitungs (mit El-Motivik⁽⁶⁾) und des Schlußteils vorliegt: verschiedene Traditionen sind bei der Komposition des Psalms übernommen worden, kaum allerdings in Form von bearbeiteten Texten. Wie an anderer Stelle zu zeigen sein wird⁽⁷⁾, geschieht dies auf dem Boden einer israelitischen Form, der Form des imperativischen Hymnus, die auch inhaltlich heterogene Elemente zusammenbindet.

Wenn keine direkte Übernahme/Bearbeitung eines Baal-Hymnus vorliegt, sondern in Jahwe mehr eingeht als 'Baal', dann spricht das auch gegen eine einfache Identifizierung von Jahwe/Baal, wie es zuweilen sowohl die These eines jahweisierten Baalstextes in Ps 29 als auch die einer Baal-/Jahwe-Identität⁽⁸⁾ verlangt.

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität
Saarstrasse 21
D - 55099 Mainz

Andreas WAGNER

⁽⁶⁾ Allerdings ist die Symbolik der Siebenzahl auch nicht auf Baal bzw. Kanaan beschränkt, muß also nicht unbedingt nur aus kanaanäischen Vorstellungen hergeleitet werden.

⁽⁶⁾ Vgl.: JEREMIAS, *Königtum Gottes*, 42-43.

⁽⁷⁾ Vgl. demnächst: J. F. DIEHL - A. A. DIESEL - A. WAGNER, Drucklegung des Vortrages, der von den Verfassern unter dem Titel *Gehalt und Gestalt von Ps 29* am 24.01.1996 in der Alttestamentlichen Sozietät der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg gehalten wurde.

⁽⁸⁾ Vgl.: M. WEIPPERT, "Synkretismus und Monotheismus. Religionsinterne Konfliktbewältigung im alten Israel", *Kultur und Konflikt* (Hrsg. J. VON ASSMANN - D. HARTH) (Frankfurt/M. 1990) 143-179.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

Israelite Aniconism in Context⁽¹⁾

In Fortführung früherer Studien⁽²⁾ leistet Trygve Mettinger in seinem neuesten Buch einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Verhältnisbestimmung von Bild, Kult und Gottesvorstellung im alten Israel und in der Hebräischen Bibel. Die *Problemstellung* des Buches bewegt sich im Schnittbereich von Kultur- bzw. Religionsgeschichte und Theologie: Arbeiten zur alttestamentlichen Theologie verstehen die Praxis der kultbildlosen YHWH-Verehrung und die biblische Ablehnung von Kultbildern⁽³⁾ (YHWHs oder anderer Gottheiten) in der Regel wie zwei Seiten einer Münze, beide aber als spezifischen Ausdruck der altisraelitischen Gottesvorstellung, und sie verbinden Praxis und Programm meist mit dem sog. Ausschließlichkeitsanspruch YHWHs. Noch für H.D. PREUB war "diese bildlose Verehrung JHWHs innerhalb des Alten Vorderen Orients so einmalig wie das Alleinverehrungsgebot JHWHs"⁽⁴⁾. Mettingers Studien stehen selbst in dieser Tradition, haben aber auch stetig dazu beigetragen, sie zu problematisieren. Das anzuzeigende Buch wird uns fortan zu erheblichen Differenzierungen zwingen, erarbeitet es doch für den israelitischen 'Anikonismus' einen breit dokumentierten altorientalischen (westsemitischen) Kontext. So viel steht fest: Kultbildlosigkeit wird künftig nicht mehr als *differentia specifica* der altisraelitischen Religion oder des biblischen Glaubens gelten können.

Das Buch hat *drei Teile*: Die Einleitung (Chap. I, 13-38) benennt Problemstellung, Terminologie und Methode; der Hauptteil legt eine breite

⁽¹⁾ Trygve N.D. METTINGER, *No Graven Image? Israelite Aniconism in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context* (ConBOT 42). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1995, 252 p. 16 × 23. SEK 192,-

⁽²⁾ Als Vorarbeit zum hier angezeigten Buch vgl. T. METTINGER, "Aniconism – a West Semitic context for the Israelite phenomenon?", *Ein Gott allein? Jhwh-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (Hrsg. W. DIETRICH – M.A. KLOPFENSTEIN) (OBO 139; Freiburg Schweiz – Göttingen 1994) 159-178; eine knappe Darstellung der Hauptthesen des Buches wird im *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995* (ed. J.A. EMERTON) (VTS; Leiden 1997) erscheinen.

⁽³⁾ Generelle Bilderfeindlichkeit in Israel/Juda kann spätestens seit S. SCHROER, *In Israel gab es Bilder. Nachrichten von darstellender Kunst im Alten Testament* (OBO 74; Freiburg Schweiz – Göttingen 1987) nicht mehr behauptet werden. Eine Reihe von Arbeiten hat gezeigt, daß das alttestamentliche sog. Bilderverbot als ein Kult- bzw. Götterbildverbot zu verstehen ist und u.a. die Herstellung von YHWH-Kultbildern untersagen will. Vgl. CH. DOHMEN, *Das Bilderverbot. Seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung im Alten Testament* (BBB 62; Frankfurt am Main ²1987), dazu meine Rez. in *BiOr* 46 (1989) 410-419.

⁽⁴⁾ *Theologie des Alten Testaments. Bd.1: JHWHs erwählendes und verpflichtendes Handeln* (Stuttgart 1991) 119.

Dokumentation anikonischer Kulte (v.a. in Verbindung mit Masseben und Betylen) in Mesopotamien und Ägypten (Chap. II, 39-56), bei den Nabatäern (Chap. III, 57-68), den vor- und früh-islamischen Arabern (Chap. IV, 69-79), in der phöniko-punischen Welt (Chap. V, 81-113) und im bronzezeitlichen Syrien und Anatolien (Chap. VI, 115-134) vor; der abschließende Teil fragt nach den Ursprüngen des "israelitischen Anikonismus" (Chap. VII, 135-197). Das letzte Kapitel bietet weit mehr, als sein Titel verspricht, hat allerdings einen etwas hybriden Charakter: Zum einen setzt es die Dokumentation fort und sammelt die archäologischen Zeugnisse für Massebenverehrung in Palästina vom Neolithikum bis in die Eisenzeit. Zum andern spricht eine "Conclusion" das Problem der Entwicklung "from West Semitic Aniconism to Israelite Iconoclasm" an und respondiert damit auf die im ersten Teil formulierten Fragen.

Biblische Texte werden im ersten und im letzten Kapitel gelegentlich genannt, aber nie ausführlicher diskutiert. Mettinger verweist hier auf seine früheren Arbeiten⁽⁵⁾, z.B. im Blick auf die Keruben im salomonischen Tempel, die er als eine historische Realität des 10. Jhs. versteht und — wie R. de Vaux⁽⁶⁾, O. Keel⁽⁷⁾ u.a. — als leeren Kerubenthron deutet. Daß er den (literarischen) salomonischen Tempel in einem Atemzug mit dem (archäologisch dokumentierten) Tempel von Arad als "positive evidence" für vorexilischen Anikonismus in Israel (*sic*) beurteilt (16-17), ist eigenartig. Ansonsten stehen archäologische Primärquellen und außerbiblische Texte klar im Vordergrund. Mettingers Buch folgt damit und mit der interessanten Verknüpfung von diachroner Perspektive und Berücksichtigung der Braudel'schen *longue durée* (im Blick auf die palästinischen Befunde) einem neuen Trend religionsgeschichtlicher Forschung und demonstriert dessen Nutzen⁽⁸⁾.

Großen Wert legt Mettinger auf *terminologische Präzision* — angesichts der gerade beim Thema Bildlosigkeit/Bilderverbot notorischen Tendenz zu Generalisierungen sicher mit Recht. Dem schwedischen Neutestamentler B. Gerhardsson entlehnt er die begriffliche Unterscheidung von *de facto tradition* und *programmatic tradition*. Auf das Thema des Anikonismus angewandt, führt dies zur wichtigen Differenzierung zwischen einer *de facto tradition*, die keine Kultbilder kennt und den Kultbildtraditionen an-

⁽⁵⁾ *The dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod theologies* (ConBOT 18; Lund 1982); *In search of God. The meaning and message of the everlasting names* (Philadelphia 1988).

⁽⁶⁾ "Les chérubins et l'arche d'alliance, les sphinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'ancien Orient", *MUSJ* 37 (1960/61) 91-124 = *Bible et Orient* (Paris 1967) 231-259.

⁽⁷⁾ *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. Eine neue Deutung der Majestätsschilderungen in Jes 6, Ez 1 und 10 und Sach 4* (SBS 84/85; Stuttgart 1977) 15-45.

⁽⁸⁾ Freilich wird bei diesem methodologisch begründeten Vorgehen erst recht zu fragen sein, ob und wie weit sich ein Autor bei seiner Interpretation der archäologischen Befunde nicht doch von biblischen Vorgaben leiten läßt. So kann von "Israelite Iconoclasm" nur reden, wer von den biblischen Texten her kommt, da eindeutige archäologische Zeugnisse dafür vorderhand nicht beizubringen sind. Und eine theologische Frage wie die nach dem Grund des biblischen Ikonoklasmas wird sich ohne Diskussion der Texte schlechterdings nicht beantworten lassen.

derer Gruppen tolerant oder indifferent gegenübersteht, und einer *programmatic tradition*, die (eigene und/oder fremde) Kultbilder ablehnt und in der Praxis zum Ikonoklasmus führen kann. Anikonismus definiert Mettinger als “cults where there is no iconic representation of the deity (anthropomorphic or theriomorphic) serving as the dominant or central cultic symbol” und unterscheidet zwei Grundgestalten: *material aniconism* und *empty space aniconism*. Bei ersterem steht ein anikonisches Objekt, etwa eine Massebe, im Zentrum der kultischen Verehrung. Bei letzterem werden bildliche oder anikonische Gegenstände so konstelliert, daß zwischen oder über ihnen ein leerer Raum entsteht oder Objekte, die gewöhnlich besetzt sind (z.B. ein Thron), auffällig leer bleiben. Die Leere suggeriert dann eine besondere Raumqualität und kann als Einwohnungsort göttlicher Gegenwart verstanden werden⁽⁹⁾.

Die *Hauptthesen* des Buches lassen sich knapp und klar resümieren: Der altisraelitische Anikonismus füge sich nahtlos in den Rahmen der westsemitischen Religionsgeschichte ein. Dies gelte für den *empty space aniconism*, den Mettinger in Israel/Juda vor allem durch die Keruben im salomonischen Tempel repräsentiert sieht. Erst recht sei aber im Bereich des *material aniconism* mit der Kontinuität vorisraelitischer und israelitischer Praktiken zu rechnen. Die israelitische Massebenverehrung gehöre in die breite Tradition der Verehrung aufgerichteter heiliger Steine, die im ganzen westsemitischen Raum als typisches *longue durée*-Phänomen bezeugt und — wiewohl auch im Innern von Tempeln durchaus gut belegt (vgl. 31-32!) — für Freilichtheiligtümer (*open-air cultic areas*) charakteristisch sei, an denen Schlachtopfermahlzeiten gefeiert und Blutriten durchgeführt worden sein. In der Bronzezeit kämen Masseben in der Regel in Gruppen vor, in der Eisenzeit dagegen meist allein. Darin spiegle sich vielleicht die Entwicklung von einem polytheistischen zu einem monotheistischen Kult. Beide Gestalten des israelitischen Anikonismus seien als *de facto*-Traditionen zu verstehen, “an inherited convention of religious expression” (195), als solche klar vorexilisch und nicht erst das Resultat der Reflexion deuteronomistischer oder anderer nachexilischer Theologen. Als israelitische *differentia specifica* könne allein die späte Sonderentwicklung einer programmatisch *anti-ikonischen* Haltung beurteilt werden, die zum Kultbildverbot und zum Ikonoklasmus geführt habe. Mettinger glaubt, daß sich Anti-Ikonismus, Ikonophobie und Ikonoklasmus in Israel sozusagen logisch aus der *de facto*-Tradition entwickelt habe. Eine gewisse Analogie dafür will er bei den Nabatäern erkennen (64-68). “Obvious traces of iconoclastic activity ... have been found. These are only explicable on the assumption that there developed a programmatic ideological awareness that took its point of departure in (an) aniconic stance. (...) Precisely the combination of iconoclastic outbursts *and* a preference for a cult around stelae or betyls is worth noting in this connection” (68). Der Beweis für die These des geneti-

⁽⁹⁾ Ganz andere Voraussetzungen legt jüngst B.B. SCHMIDT zugrunde: “The Aniconic Tradition. On Reading Images and Viewing Texts”, *The Triumph of Elohism. From Yahwisms to Judaisms* (ed. D. V. EDELMAN) (CBET 13; Kampen 1995) 75-105 (zu Mettinger vgl. ebd. 77-78).

schen Zusammenhangs von *de facto*-Anikonismus und programmatischem Ikonoklasmos unterbleibt hier allerdings ebenso wie beim biblischen Material. Eine ähnliche Entwicklung bei den Arabern im Übergang zum Islam ist teilweise durch den biblischen Kultbild-und-Masseben-Ikonoklasmos beeinflusst (77-78) und stellt keine unabhängige Analogie dar.

Mettinger ist für die *hervorragende Quellendokumentation* zum Massebenkult im westsemitischen Raum zu danken⁽¹⁰⁾. Seine Studie basiert auf breitester Kenntnis der Quellen, der Primär- und der Sekundärliteratur⁽¹¹⁾ und bietet gleichzeitig eine leicht lesbare Synthese, die dank einer genau definierten Problemstellung immer bei der Sache bleibt und nie ausufert. Ich wüßte dieser Dokumentation *materialiter* kaum etwas hinzuzufügen⁽¹²⁾. Die folgenden kritischen Anmerkungen betreffen zum einen ausgewählte religionsgeschichtliche Einzelprobleme, zum andern Terminologie und Methode. Sie wollen auf Bereiche hinweisen, wo Mettingers Studie m.E. einen erheblichen Problemüberhang hat und Probleme anstößt, die weiterer Diskussion bedürfen⁽¹³⁾.

1. Kultbilder, Masseben und das Konzept "aniconism"

Mettingers Studie legt großen Wert auf die Unterscheidung von ikonischem und anikonischem Kult: Ersterem entsprächen in einer phänomenologischen Idealtypik Kultbild bzw.-statue, der Tempel als Haus und die Versorgung der Gottheit ("the care and feeding of the gods" nach A. L. Oppenheim⁽¹⁴⁾), letzterem Masseben und Ascheren, Freilichtheiligtum und gemeinschaftliches Schlachtopfermahl (30).

"One may, of course, raise the question whether the modern, etic distinction between iconic and aniconic does justice to the material" (20). Läßt sich zwischen Kultstatue und Massebe wirklich eine klare Grenze ziehen? Angesichts des "important proviso that our knowledge of the 'theology of images' in the ancient Near East is still very incomplete" (23)⁽¹⁵⁾ ist die Frage kaum ganz generell mit Ja oder Nein zu beantworten. Sicher gibt es Differenzen, die jedoch nicht notwendig mit der unterschiedlichen

⁽¹⁰⁾ Manche Abbildungen (2.5, 3.3-4, 5.4, 5.8-11) wären allerdings verbesserungsfähig und lassen keinerlei Details erkennen.

⁽¹¹⁾ Daß eine derart breit angelegte Untersuchung auch einmal der Sekundärliteratur in die Falle laufen kann, ist unvermeidlich. Dies geschieht hier etwa, wenn Mettinger die von W. MAYER praktisch *e silentio* argumentierende These von der Kultbildlosigkeit des Gottes Assur ("Assur – der Gott, seine Stadt und sein Reich", *MARG* 9 [1994] 227-238) übernimmt, obwohl assyrische Bilder und Texte klar auf die Existenz eines Kultbildes weisen.

⁽¹²⁾ Vgl. nun W. ZWICKEL, *Der Tempelkult in Kanaan und Israel. Studien zur Kultgeschichte Palästinas von der Mittelbronzezeit bis zum Untergang Judas* (FAT 10; Tübingen 1994).

⁽¹³⁾ Vgl. bereits O. LORETZ, "Semitischer Anikonismus und biblisches Bilderverbot", *UF* 26 (1994; ersch. 1995) 209-223.

⁽¹⁴⁾ *Ancient Mesopotamia. Portrait of a Dead Civilization* (revised ed. completed by E. REINER) (Chicago 1977) 183-198.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Eine Heidelberger Dissertation von Angelika BERLEJUNG, die 1997 in der Reihe *OBO* erscheinen soll, wird hier Klärungen bringen. Vgl. bereits dies., "Der Handwerker als Theologe: Zur Mentalitäts- und Traditionsgeschichte eines altorientalischen und alttestamentlichen Berufsstands", *VT* 46 (1996) 145-168.

Gestalt des Objekts der Verehrung zusammenhängen müssen: Eine Massebe kann mit Blut bestrichen werden; Zeugnisse dafür, daß solches auch mit einer Kultstatue gemacht werden konnte, sind mir nicht bekannt (um eine Statue mit Leben zu erfüllen, kannte der Alte Orient andere Riten). Andererseits kann Jakob aber eine Massebe salben (Gen 28,18), d.h. mit einem Ritus ehren, der seinen Ursprung in der Pflege von Kultstatuen haben dürfte, was zeigt, daß eine Massebe u.U. wie eine Kultstatue behandelt werden konnte. Neben den Differenzen gibt es also auch Gemeinsamkeiten.

Texte und archäologische Befunde zeigen, daß die Grenze zwischen Kultstatue, Stele und Massebe offenbar weder randscharf noch absolut dicht war. Die Befunde sind wie so oft komplexer als die Idealtypik: Vor dem mittelbronzezeitlichen Heiligtum von Tel Kittan stand in der Mitte einer Reihe von anikonischen Masseben eine grob skulptierte, die offensichtlich eine Göttin darstellen soll (182-183): Die Reihe beweist, daß der *Übergang* von der anikonischen zur ikonischen Repräsentation schon im frühen 2. Jt. *fließend* sein konnte. Im spätbronzezeitlichen Stelenheiligtum 6136 von Hazor (179-181) fanden sich neben Masseben eine skulptierte Stele (Mondsymbol und erhobene Arme) und eine Sitzstatue, ohne daß eine prinzipielle oder eine funktionale Differenz zwischen den anikonischen und den ikonischen Repräsentationen erkennbar wäre. Im Heiligtum von 'En Haseva aus dem 7.(?)-6. Jh. stand neben einer großen Zahl von anthropomorphen Tonfigurinen (die Verehrerinnen und Verehrer darstellen dürften) und anikonischen Masseben auch eine sorgfältig behauene Stele, die eine minimale ikonische Bearbeitung zeigt (¹⁶).

Texte dokumentieren überdies für verschiedene Orte und Zeiten ein unproblematisches *Nebeneinander* von Kultbildern und Masseben: In Mari koexistierten ikonische und anikonische, auf *sikkānu*-Steine ausgerichtete Kulte (116) (¹⁷), und Ähnliches scheint für Qatna zu gelten (120). Im *zukru*-Ritual von Emar wurden Götterbilder und Masseben miteinander herumgetragen (vgl. 120-122), und man hat hier durchaus den Eindruck, die Masseben hätten gleiche Funktion und Bedeutung wie die Götterbilder, würden (etwas überspitzt formuliert) *als solche* verstanden (¹⁸). Für die Nabatäer konstatiert Mettinger "a tension between anthropomorphic and aniconic representations" (58), und im Semeion von Hierapolis befand sich noch im 3. Jh. u. Z. "an aniconic representation of the main deity of the city who is also depicted in anthropomorphic form in the same *adyton*" (110).

(¹⁶) R. COHEN – Y. YISRAEL, *On the Road to Edom. Discoveries from 'En Haseva* (The Israel Museum, Catalogue no. 370; Jerusalem 1995) 28 und 28 (hebr. Teil).

(¹⁷) Daß eine *sikkānu*-Stele notwendigerweise anikonisch sein *mußte*, ist m.W. nicht erwiesen.

(¹⁸) Ein berühmter Stamnos im Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, der ca. 420-410 v.u.Z. datiert wird (*LIMC* 3 [1986] 426 Nr. 33 mit Taf. 298), zeigt sehr schön, wie ein anikonischer steinerner 'Kultpfahl' des Dionysos durch Behängen mit einem Kleid und Aufsetzen einer Maske zum *Kultbild* unfunktioniert werden konnte. Vgl. dazu C. GASPARRI, "Dionysos", *LIMC* 3 (1986) 420-514, bes. 424-427 mit Taf. 298-300 Nr. 36-43; zur Sache J.-L. DURAND – F. FRONTISI-DUCROUX, "Idoles, figures, images: autour de Dionysos", *RArch* (1982) 81-108.

Primärquellen verschiedenster Perioden dokumentieren also die Möglichkeit eines fließenden Übergangs bzw. eines umproblematischen Nebeneinanders von ikonischen, teilweise ikonischen und anikonischen Kultempfängern, von Massebe, behauenen Stein und Kultstatue im westsemitischen Raum. Mettinger weiß um dieses Nebeneinander und dokumentiert es auch sorgfältig in seiner Befundpräsentation, will es jedoch als “fusion of a West Semitic plainstone tradition with the artistic traditions of Mesopotamia and Egypt with their anthropomorphic depictions” erklären (128). Das Nebeneinander wird genetisch dissoziiert, weil es der “overall impression”, die westsemitischen Kulte der Bronzezeit seien “generally aniconic” gewesen (195), widerspricht. Aber die idealtypische Dichotomie suggeriert eine essentielle Differenz von westsemitischen Kulturen und solchen der beiden umliegenden ‘Hochkulturen’, die so von den Quellen nicht getragen wird.

Überhaupt impliziert der Begriff “aniconism” *als solcher* einen Gegensatz, der in seiner Schärfe den Primärquellenbefunden des öfteren nicht adäquat ist. Mettinger gibt zu (20), daß Begriff und Gegensatz in der alttestamentlichen Bilderpolemik wurzeln. Damit dürfte kaum der beste Ausgangspunkt für eine religionsgeschichtliche Interpretation der altorientalischen Primärbefunde gewählt sein. Mettinger wird nicht müde zu betonen, daß die westsemitische Massebenverehrung als *de facto*-Tradition zu verstehen sei, die der Kultbildverehrung gegenüber weitgehend indifferent oder tolerant gewesen sei. Trifft dies zu (und die genannten Primärquellenbefunde weisen m.E. eindeutig in diese Richtung), dann scheint der Begriff “Anikonismus”, der ja rein morphologisch eine explizite Negation beinhaltet, nicht sehr geeignet zu sein, um diese *de facto*-Tradition zu qualifizieren. Daß eine Massebe ein dezidiert anikonisches Kultsymbol darstelle, dürfte frühestens für jene Theologen bedeutsam geworden sein, die Kultbilder für verwerflich erklärten, Masseben dagegen für erlaubt hielten.

Sicher: “At some point in the procedure ... it is necessary to establish a grid system of etic categories that embraces the entire landscape being mapped” (20), und so hat das Adjektiv *aniconic* als deskriptiv-analytische Kategorie auch bei der Diskussion von Masseben durchaus seine Berechtigung. Mettinger stellt aber mit der Leitkategorie *aniconism* die Weichen ganz zu Beginn, noch *vor* der Befundaufnahme und -diskussion. Die Konsequenz davon ist, daß Kultbild und Massebe, Bilderkult und Massebenverehrung *a priori* in einen essentiellen Antagonismus gezwängt, die Kultbilder und das Problem ihres Verhältnisses zu den Masseben sozusagen *per definitionem* ausgeblendet werden. Auf dieser Grundlage ist es kaum möglich, die gemeinsamen und die unterschiedlichen Bedeutungen, Funktionen und Leistungen von Kultbildverehrung und ‘Anikonismus’ zu erheben.

2. Die Midianiter und die bildlosen Ursprünge des YHWH-Kults

Im Zusammenhang der Frage nach der Herkunft des altisraelitischen Massebenkultes stellt Mettinger die These auf, der YHWH-Kult sei wohl von seinen Anfängen an anikonisch gewesen. Er begründet dies zum einen mit dem Hinweis auf die überaus zahlreichen *maššebot sites*, die im Sinai und im Negev seit dem 11. Jahrtausend und bis zu Zeiten nabatäischer Präsenz

bezeugt seien⁽¹⁹⁾, zum andern mit der Überlegung, gerade diese Region und Nordwestarabien seien die Heimat der Schasu-Gruppen bzw. Midianiter/Keniter. Diese aber hätten im Übergang von der Spätbronze- zur frühen Eisenzeit die Verehrung des Gottes YHWH nach Palästina gebracht und ihren Gott somit wohl im Rahmen eines anikonischen Massebenkultes verehrt (168-174). Besonderes Gewicht tragen bei der Begründung die Masseben von Timna (Süd), die zeigen, daß die 'Midianiter' tatsächlich Massebenkulte pflegten.

Mettingers These operiert — so plausibel sie zunächst erscheinen mag — mit einer so großen Zahl von Unbekannten, daß sie von vorneherein als ganz spekulativ zu beurteilen ist. Die *connective evidence* fehlt, und es ist deshalb voreilig, aus den 'midianitischen' Masseben in Timna Schlüsse für den frühen (Schasu-)Jahwismus ziehen zu wollen. Die These nimmt zwar vordergründig bei den archäologischen Befunden ihren Ausgang, bürdet ihnen jedoch die Last von sachfernen Hypothesen auf, die die Befunde selbst überfordert. Im Hintergrund scheint das (theologische) Interesse leitend zu sein, die Bildlosigkeit der YHWH-Verehrung seit ihren Ursprüngen nachweisen zu können: Gelänge dies, so wäre Bildlosigkeit zwar keine *differentia specifica* der YHWH-Verehrung mehr, gehörte jedoch zu deren ursprünglicher *essentia*⁽²⁰⁾.

Nun ist das Neben- und Ineinander von 'midianitischer' Massebenverehrung und ägyptischem Heiligtum in Timna (Süd) kultursoziologisch in der Tat bemerkenswert, weil es ein Modell der *Kohabitation* zweier *de facto*-Traditionen unterschiedlicher Ethnien darstellt. Aber Mettingers Befunderhebung ist problematisch: Sie konzentriert sich in bezug auf den midianitischen Kult ganz auf die Masseben und übersieht, daß im Heiligtum von Timna auch zwei anthropomorphe Götterfiguren aus Bronze gefunden worden sind⁽²¹⁾. Die qualitativ bessere zweite, die einen ithyphallischen Gott darstellt, scheint am Ort selbst hergestellt worden zu sein, da sich zwischen

⁽¹⁹⁾ Hier steht Mettinger in engem Gespräch mit Uzi AVNER und dessen Forschungen, vgl. "Mazzebot sites in the Negev and Sinai and their significance", *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990* (ed. A. BIRAN – J. AVIRAM) (Jerusalem 1993) 166-181.

⁽²⁰⁾ Es ist von hier ein kleiner Schritt zu der schlechterdings absurden Hypothese J. G. TAYLORS ("The Two Earliest Known Representations [*sic*] of Yahweh", *Ascribe to the Lord. Biblical and Others Studies in Memory of P. C. Craigie* [ed. L. ESSLINGER – J. G. TAYLOR] [JSOTSS 67; Sheffield 1988] 557-566; id., *Yahweh and the Sun. Biblical and Archaeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel* [JSOTSS 111; Sheffield 1993] bes. 29-30), eine Aussparung auf dem bekannteren der beiden Kultständer von Ta'anach sei als Darstellung(!) des unsichtbaren(!) Jahwe zu interpretieren — eine These, von der Mettinger (164-165) sich leider nicht klar genug distanziert. Zur Kritik vgl. O. KEEL – CH. UEHLINGER, *Göttinnen, Götter und Gottes-symbole* (QD 134; Freiburg i.Br. 1992, 41997) § 98. Der Kultständer ist in einer Diskussion des 'israelitischen' Anikonismus ganz einfach fehl am Platz. Daß es zu derartigen Thesen überhaupt kommen kann, obwohl die Primärquellen sie in keiner Weise fordern, liegt an dem nur schwer zu unterlaufenden Druck, mit dem biblische Konzepte (in diesem Fall die Unsichtbarkeit YHWHs), die im Unterschied zu den Primärquellen von der Dignität kanonischer Normativität zehren, immer wieder unsere Wahrnehmung und Interpretation der archäologischen Befunde determinieren.

⁽²¹⁾ B. ROTHENBERG u.a., *The Egyptian Mining Temple at Timna* (London 1988) 147, Met.Cat. No. 1 (mit Col. Pl. 29 und Fig. 53:1) und Met.Cat. No. 2 (mit Pl. 126:6 und Fig. 126:1-2).

den Beinen noch Reste des Gußmodels erhalten hatten. Die ganz unägyptische Erscheinung beider Figuren zeigt, daß sie nicht den ägyptischen Expeditionen, sondern den 'Midianitern' zuzuweisen sind und mit deren Nutzung des Tempels zusammenhängen. Ist jedoch "gewiß, daß die Midianiter Götterbilder kannten" ⁽²²⁾, dann können die Masseben von Timna nicht mehr als Beleg für die grundsätzliche Bildlosigkeit des midianitischen Kultes gelten und fällt das Kartenhaus der bildlosen Ursprünge der YHWH-Verehrung in sich zusammen.

3. Kultbildlose YHWH-Verehrung in vorexilischer Zeit?

Eine ganze Reihe von biblischen Texten steht bekanntlich in Spannung zur These eines bildlosen YHWH-Kultes. Mettinger kennt sowohl diese Texte als auch die archäologischen, ikonographischen und inschriftlichen Belege für Kultstatuen und andere therio- oder anthropomorphe Darstellungen von Gottheiten aus dem eisenzeitlichen Palästina ⁽²³⁾. Er will sie jedoch nicht eigens diskutieren, weil der Anikonismus sein Thema ist (136), tendiert allerdings dazu, sie wenn möglich im Sinne des *empty-space aniconism* zu deuten: Die Stierbilder oder die Keruben signalisieren die Präsenz des *unsichtbaren* YHWH. Da Mettinger der biblischen Darstellung folgend annimmt, beide Repräsentationsgestalten seien ins 10. Jh. zu datieren, kann er so neben dem originär-jahwistischen Massebenkult (*material aniconism*) einen gleichfalls anikonischen YHWHkult auf der Ebene des offiziellen Staatskults seit der frühen Königszeit postulieren. "That official religion was basically aniconic is agreed on by a number of scholars" (136), "the suggestion that there was an image of YHWH in Solomon's temple seems out of the question" (16).

Ich habe diesen Konsens selber geteilt ⁽²⁴⁾. Er kann heute nicht mehr einfach vorausgesetzt werden. O. Loretz, H. Niehr u.a. verstehen das biblische Verbot eines YHWH-Kultbildes, Einrichtungen wie die Schaubrote und Wendungen wie "YHWHs Angesicht aufsuchen" als deutliche Indizien dafür, daß es auch im Jerusalemer Tempel eine Kultstatue YHWHs gegeben haben müsse. Argumente *e contrario* und *per analogiam* mögen einem nicht immer ganz geheuer sein, sie sind in Ermangelung positiver, historisch verlässlicher Indizien zumindest diskutabel. Gegenüber der nachgerade traditionellen Annahme eines Kerubenthrons seit der Zeit Salomos sei nur daran erinnert, daß es in der phönizischen Ikonographie (vgl. Mettinger 100-103 und 113) vor der EZ II C keine Belege für *leere* Kerubenthronen gibt. Wenn die Keruben des 'salomonischen' Tempels als leerer Kerubenthron phönizischer Inspiration zu deuten sind (139 u.ö.), wofür sicher manches spricht, haben sie angesichts des sidonischen Vergleichsmaterials in der EZ II C

⁽²²⁾ E. A. KNAUF, *Die Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (NSK.AT 29; Stuttgart 1994) 256.

⁽²³⁾ Vgl. CH. UEHLINGER, "Eine anthropomorphe Kultstatue des Gottes von Dan?", *BN* 72 (1994) 85-100, wo ich auch meine eigene These, im Israel der EZ II A seien anthropomorphe Götterbilder "offensichtlich nicht mehr hergestellt worden" (so noch in KEEL – UEHLINGER, *Göttinnen*, § 82), als zu pauschal bezeichnet und entsprechend relativiert habe.

⁽²⁴⁾ Vgl. KEEL – UEHLINGER, *Göttinnen*, § 104.

(oder als literarische Schöpfungen der nachexilischen Zeit) einen mindestens so plausiblen Ort wie im 10. Jh. Die auf der funktionalen Äquivalenz von leerem Kerubenthron und Thron, auf dem Stelen stehen, basierende Gleichung "stelae equal empty space" (106) ist vor der persischen Zeit kaum denkbar — davon ganz abgesehen, daß die letztgenannte Hypothese an sich unnötig ist und jeglicher Plausibilität entbehrt.

Was die Situation im Nordreich betrifft⁽²⁵⁾, so ist die These vom Stierbild als dem Podesttier für den unsichtbaren YHWH durchaus problematisch und jedenfalls von den biblischen Texten selber (1 Kön 12; Ex 32; Hos) nicht gedeckt. Neue Aufmerksamkeit wird heute auch dem Hinweis Sargons II. im Nimrud-Prisma zuteil, er habe bei der Eroberung von Samaria "die Gottheiten, auf die sie vertrauten, als Beute gezählt"⁽²⁶⁾. Mettingers Bemerkung "The wording ... is formulaic" (136, vgl. 194-195; so auch 84 im Blick auf Tyrus) ist zwar zuzustimmen, aber eine geprägte Wendung ist kein Grund, die Faktizität der Deportation von samaritanischen Kultstatuen zu bezweifeln. Die assyrischen Eroberungsberichte nennen diese Praxis nämlich nicht generell, sondern nur dort, wo Derartiges in der Tat stattgefunden haben dürfte. So bleibt in der Frage nach der Existenz von Kultbildern im vorexilischen Jahwismus durchaus noch eine erhebliche Marge der Unsicherheit, die näherer Erforschung bedarf.

4. *De facto-Anikonismus und biblisches Bilderverbot*

Mettinger versteht den israelitischen *material aniconism* mit Recht als Teil der nordwestsemitischen *longue durée*-Tradition der Massebenverehrung, und diese Hauptthese seines Buches wird angesichts seiner eindrücklichen Dokumentation niemand mehr bezweifeln wollen. Sein Versuch, andere Phänomene wie den leeren Kerubenthron oder das biblische Kultbilderverbot auf der gleichen Linie als Teil ein und desselben "Israelite aniconism" zu verstehen und für diesen eine lineare Entwicklung von logischer Konsequenz vom *de facto aniconism* zum *programmatic aniconism* zu postulieren, führt dagegen m.E. ins Leere. "Der Test seiner These am biblischen Material unterbleibt. Wir warten vergebens auf einen detaillierten Nachweis des postulierten Übergangs vom materiellen Anikonismus der Masseben zum programmatischen Anikonismus des Bildverbotes"⁽²⁷⁾. Wie sollte von einem, wie Mettinger zu Recht immer wieder betont, gegenüber Kultbildern grundsätzlich toleranten *de facto aniconism* ein direkter Weg zum biblischen Kultbilderverbot führen, erst recht zum biblischen Ikonoklasmus, der in seiner letzten Konsequenz ja auch die Zerstörung von Masseben und Ascheren — also anikonischer Kultobjekte — forderte (Ex 23,24; 34,13; Dtn 7,5; 12,3)?

Wer eine Erklärung für das biblische Kultbilderverbot sucht, erst recht, wo es sich dezidiert um ein YHWH-Kultbilderverbot handelt, wird die Ebene der

⁽²⁵⁾ Nur am Rande sei bemerkt, daß Mettingers Untersuchung m.E. zu wenig zwischen Israel/*bīt-Humrī* und Juda/*bīt-Daud* differenziert und mit seiner gesamtisraelitischen Perspektive wiederum biblischen Vorgaben folgt.

⁽²⁶⁾ Vgl. zuletzt B. BECKING, *The Fall of Samaria. An Historical and Archaeological Study* (SHANE 2; Leiden 1992) 28-31.

⁽²⁷⁾ LORETZ, "Semitischer Anikonismus", 214-215.

longue durée verlassen und auf der des *temps conjoncturel* weitersuchen müssen. Die palästinische Ikonographie der EZ II tendiert in mancherlei Hinsicht zu einer (u.U. gattungsgebundenen) Relativierung anthropomorpher Gottesrepräsentation (Sonnensymbolik, Mondsichelstandarte und andere syrisch-mesopotamische Kultsymbole; vgl. Mettinger 194). Biblische Texte weisen auf eine zunehmende Problematisierung theriomorpher Repräsentationen in gewissen Oberschichtskreisen der israelitisch-judäischen Gesellschaft (Stierbilder bei Hosea, Nehustan zur Zeit Hiskijas). Ich sehe keinen Grund für die Annahme, diese Tendenzen stünden mit der Präferenz für anikonische genetischen Massebenverehrung (Mettingers *de facto aniconism*) in irgendeinem Zusammenhang.

Richtig ist allerdings, daß das alttestamentliche Kultbildverbot zunächst restriktiv auf Kultbilder aus Gold und Silber beschränkt war (Ex 20,3-6.22-26; Lev 19,4; Dtn 5,7-10; 27,15) und die einschlägigen Texte mit Masseben noch kein Problem haben, YHWH also durchaus traditionell bei Masseben verehrt wurde. Dafür aber, daß die alte Möglichkeit nicht-anthropomorphen YHWH-Kults zu einem dezidiert *anti-ikonischen Programm* umschlagen konnte, das sich in letzter Radikalität selbst gegen die eigene Tradition der YHWH-Verehrung bei Masseben richten sollte, bedurfte es m.E. anderer Anstöße: Vielleicht des Verlustes der zentralen Kultsymbole des vorexilischen Jerusalemer Tempels⁽²⁸⁾ (Sach 4* konzentriert sich in frühpersischer Zeit bemerkenswerterweise ganz auf den Leuchter); vermutlich des Umstands, daß die nachexilische 'Restauration' wesentlich von der Gola getragen wurde, die mittlerweile ihre eigene Distanzierung vom (babylonischen) Bilderkult geleistet hatte und weder die Notwendigkeit sah noch vielleicht die Möglichkeit dazu hatte, in 'ihrem' Tempel ein legitimes YHWH-Bild einzurichten; sicher der Notwendigkeit, den neuen Tempel und die 'Bürger-Tempel-Gemeinde' in Auseinandersetzung mit der im Land verbliebenen jahwistischen Bevölkerung und in Absetzung von deren traditionellen Kultorten und -formen (Lokalheiligtümer mit Masseben und Ascheren, Ahnenkult) zu konsolidieren. Dtr Texte lehnen die durchaus traditionellen Masseben und Ascheren als 'kanaanäisches' Kultinventar ab (Dtn 16,22 u.ö.) und fordern zu ihrer Zerstörung auf (Dtn 7,5; 12,3; Ex 23,24). Ex 34,12-17 verknüpft die ikonoklastische Linie und das Kultbildverbot. Lev 26,1 (vgl. Mi 5,12) wird schließlich Masseben, aber auch "behauene Steine" ganz unter das Kultbildverbot subsumieren⁽²⁹⁾. All diese Texte demonstrieren, daß bis zur effektiven Durchsetzung des YHWH-Kultbildverbots⁽³⁰⁾ in Juda ein langer Weg zu gehen blieb⁽³¹⁾.

Biblisches Institut
Universität Freiburg – Miséricorde
CH-1700 Freiburg Schweiz

Christoph UEHLINGER

⁽²⁸⁾ In diese Richtung tendiert — freilich ohne positive Evidenz — die Erklärung von SCHMIDT, "The Aniconic Tradition", 104.

⁽²⁹⁾ Die Annahme liegt nahe, daß die Wendung *'eben maskîl* (vgl. Num 33,52) sich auf geringfügig skulptierte Objekte wie die oben genannte Stele von 'En Haseva bezieht.

⁽³⁰⁾ Vgl. dazu D. V. EDELMAN, "Tracking Observance of the Aniconic Tradition Through Numismatics", *The Triumph*, 185-225.

⁽³¹⁾ For a response to this review see T. METTINGER "Israelite Aniconism", *The Image and the Book* (ed. K. van der TOORN) (forthcoming, Kampen).

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Eryl W. DAVIES, *Numbers* (The New Century Bible Commentary).
Grand Rapids, MI, W.B. Eerdmans Publishers, 1995. XLI-378
p. 13,5 × 21,5. £30.00 - \$23.00

Nach einem beinahe überlangen Hiatus der Kommentierung des Buches Numeri (1903 entstanden die drei großen Werken von H. Holzinger, B. Baentsch und G.B. Gray), den knappe Kommentare eher zum Appetitanregen füllten (Ausnahme J. de Vaulx, *Les Nombres* [SB; Paris 1972]), gibt es seit ca. 10 Jahren nun wieder eine Reihe größerer Kommentare zu diesem anerkannt schwer zu erklärenden Buch: P.J. Budd (WBC; Waco, TX 1984); J. Milgrom (JPS; Philadelphia, PA – New York 1989); B.A. Levine, *Numbers 1-20* (AB 4A; Garden City, NY 1993); T.R. Ashley (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1993); H. Seebass (BK 4; Neukirchen-Vluyn) Lfg. 1 (1993); Lfg. 2 (1995). Der hier anzuzeigende Kommentar von E.W. Davies sucht einen Mittelweg: er ist etwas ausführlicher als z.B. M. Noth, *Numeri* (ATD 7; Göttingen 1966), aber kürzer als der von P.J. Budd und bietet gleichwohl auf knappem Raum nicht wenig Material zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion. In diesem Wohl zur Absicht knapp gewählten Rahmen leistet er einen wertvollen Beitrag, indem er begründet, warum es sich empfiehlt, wichtige Einsichten früherer Forschergenerationen (genannt seien zumal die von G.B. Gray und M. Noth) nicht wegen neuer Forschungstrends einfach aufzugeben.

Gegliedert ist das Buch in "Introduction" (XLV-LXXIV) und "Comment" (1-378). Die "Introduction" behandelt neben dem Titel Numeri äußerst knapp die Quellen, die Struktur, den religionsgeschichtlichen Beitrag (kein Versuch der Übertragung in die Gegenwart) und den historischen Wert. Zu den Quellen: in Auseinandersetzung mit R. Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin-New York 1977), urteilt D., daß es gute Gründe gibt, an durchgehenden Quellen festzuhalten, zumal die Verbindungsstücke zwischen den von Rendtorff angenommenen fünf Blöcken nicht sicher dtr sind. E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin-New York 1990) fehlt zwar im Literatur-Verzeichnis, würde aber D.s Meinung kaum ändern. In Num sei freilich der Elohist neben dem Jahwisten nicht sicher nachweisbar, wohl aber sei die (im einzelnen nicht immer zuverlässige) Unterscheidung zwischen P^s und P^s in Num berechtigt.

Zur Struktur: die bekannten Schwierigkeiten ihrer Bestimmung bleiben. Nach Diskussion mit anderen Modellen (D. kennt die wichtige Arbeit von M. Douglas, *In the Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers* [JSOTSS 158; Sheffield 1993], nicht) findet er mit D.J.A. Clines,

The Theme of the Pentateuch (JSOTSS 10; Sheffield 1978) die Bewegung zum Land als das Strukturierende, obwohl die Stellung mehrerer Abschnitte "remains an enigma" (LVII).

Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Beitrag: D. verfolgt nur beispielhaft die drei Themen "Land", "Priester und Leviten" sowie "Reinheit und Heiligkeit" in ihrer Bedeutung für die Neuordnung nach dem Exil.

Zum historischen Wert: in sympathischer Weise gibt D. zu bedenken, daß bei J angehörenden Stücken die Historizität im Einzelfall sorgfältig geprüft werden muß und ein herrschender Trend zur Spätdatierung häufig nicht auf guten Gründen ruht.

Die Kommentierung kann ich nur in ihren Grundlinien und an einigen Beispielen aufzeigen. D. gliedert seine Exegese in eine Grundsatzdiskussion zu dem jeweiligen Abschnitt und in eine Einzelexegese. Die Grundsatzdiskussion nimmt wichtigste Stimme der neueren Literatur auf, konfrontiert sie mit Stimmen älterer Literatur, vor allem mit denen der vorigen Forschergeneration, und sucht ein abgewogenes Urteil zu finden, das zumeist auf der Linie etwa von G. B. Gray, M. Noth, V. Fritz, *Israel in der Wüste* (MThSt 7; Marburg 1970); G. W. Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness* (Nashville 1968) u.ä. liegt. Die Einzelexegese geht nicht Vers für Vers vor, sondern erklärt einzelne Schlüsselsätze und verwendet viel Sorgfalt auf strittige philologische oder sachliche Einzelheiten. Den Leser konfrontiert D. gern mit mehr als einer Verständnismöglichkeit, er wird so zu einem Teil in die wissenschaftliche Diskussion einbezogen. Wenn ich recht sehe, verzichtet D. durchweg auf neue, eigene Thesen, die die Diskussion weitertreiben, sondern sucht das seiner Meinung nach derzeit am besten Begründete mitzuteilen.

Das man Beispiele ohnehin nicht unbegrenzt bieten kann, wähle ich vor allem solche aus dem Bereich, an dem ich gerade arbeite (Num 15–25). Da ist es von vornherein erfreulich, daß ich von einem Konsens in Grundsatzfragen ausgehen kann, und es ist ein Gewinn, daß die Art der Argumentation überall maßvoll und umsichtig vorgeht. Bei einem so schwer zu erklärenden Text darf es jedoch nicht verwundern, daß ich nicht immer gleicher Meinung bin wie D. So seien einige Beispiele genannt, die einerseits das sorgfältige Urteil von D. belegen, andererseits aber auch andere Schlüsse erlauben.

Zu 16,1–17,28 (MT-Zählung) setzt D. sich zwar gut begründet mit neueren Erklärungen auseinander und folgt dann im Wesentlichen M. Noths Erklärung; aber er hat nicht erfaßt, daß der Konflikt der älteren P-Schicht sich nur um Räucherwerk dreht, das auch Laien darbringen wollen und das vorexilisch ein erhebliches Konfliktpotential hinterlassen hat, woraus sich Folgen für das Verständnis des Gotteszorns in 16,34–35; 17,6–15 ergeben. Im Literatur-Verzeichnis fehlen diesbezüglich W. Zwickel, *Räucher kult und Räuchergeräte* (OBO 97; Fribourg/Suisse–Göttingen 1990) und K. Nielsen, *Incense in Ancient Israel* (VTS 38; Leiden 1986). Es wird dann fraglich, ob man 17,16–26.(27–28) als Anhang und nicht als Lösung des Konfliktes verstehen muß. Zu Kap. 15 vermerkt D. treffend, daß 15,32–36 nicht mehr die Erklärung erlaubt, es sei wie in 15,1–31 die gewisse Aussicht auf den Landbesitz betont (LVII). Er übergeht aber, daß 15,32–36

mit seiner Ortsveränderung einen teilenden Einschnitt markiert, so daß kein Zusammenhang mit Num 13–14 *beabsichtigt* ist. Zu 21,1–3 gibt D. die traditionelle Meinung wieder, daß es nicht an der richtigen Stelle steht. Da D. aber 21,4a ohnehin für redaktionell hält, würde sich die Erwägung gelohnt haben, ob 21,1–3 eine *Nordumgehung* Edoms andeuten. D. begründet überzeugend, daß 22,1 den 2. Teil des Buches schließt, und würdigt, daß 22,1 erst in Kap. 26 wiederaufgenommen wird. Er zieht aber keine Schlüsse daraus, was die Rolle von 22,2–25,18 angeht. Sehr gelungen scheinen mir die exegetischen Ausführungen zu 22,2–24,25, auch wenn man hier den Elohisten besser nicht leugnet. In gewohnten Bahnen hebt D. zu 25,1–18 die Vv. 1–5 schroff von den Vv. 6–13, (14–15) ab, ohne zu fragen, was die Endredaktion sich bei der gegenwärtigen Aufeinanderfolge gedacht haben könnte.

Das führt zu einer weiteren Anfrage. Mit D. begrüße ich einen würdigen Mitstreiter um die Quellenscheidung im Pentateuch, zumal in der Art seines Urteils. Unter den wenigen wirklich wichtigen neuen Fragen zur Entstehung und Erklärung des Pentateuch gehört nun aber, m.E. die nach der Art und Weise, wie gesetzliche Partien zum Recht und zum Kult mit den erzählenden verbunden worden sind, welcher Sinn sich daraus für die Großkomposition ergibt und ob dabei neue Erkenntnisse zu bisher als ungeordnet Empfundene gewonnen werden können. In genau diesem Sinne, also nicht bloß als Material zur Bestreitung oder Verteidigung der Quellenscheidung und ihres Geschichtsbildes, gewinnt m.E. die Erklärung des Buches Num strategische Bedeutung für die Pentateuchklärung (s.o. zum Artikel "Pentateuch" in der *TRE* 1996). So sehr ich auf D.s Erklärung höre, so sehr vermisste ich hier die Wahrnehmung einer neuen Herausforderung.

Müßte nicht bei solcher Wahrnehmung der in nicht wenigen Partien die Forschung weitertreibende Kommentar von J. Milgrom eine grössere Rolle spielen, vor allem bei kultisch-rituellen Texten? Da D. nachweislich im einzelnen Literatur bis 1994 berücksichtigt hat, wäre vielleicht auch die erste Lieferung des auflagenstarken Biblischen Kommentars von 1993 berücksichtigungsfähig gewesen. Fehlt wegen der wichtigen Bearbeitung altorientalischer Texte zu Moab nicht etwa auch S. Timm, *Moab zwischen den Mächten* (ÄAT 17; Wiesbaden 1989) zu 21,21–31?

Die Anfragen sollen in keiner Weise einschränken, daß ich den Kommentar von D. wegen seines gut begründeten, ausgewogenen Urteils der weiteren Diskussion empfehlen möchte. Er ist jedoch m.E. für den eiligen Leser bestimmt, der sich auf knappem Raum ein Bild zu wichtigsten Erkenntnissen und Problemen verschaffen will und zu philologischen Schwierigkeiten Aufklärung wünscht. Einen (oder mehrere?) großen Kommentar macht er nicht überflüssig, der wegen der neu entfachten Pentateuchfrage ansteht. Auf viele offene Fragen macht D. freilich selbst aufmerksam, was man nur schätzen kann. Denn sie bleiben auch in Zukunft gewiß keinem Kommentar erspart, er sei groß oder weniger groß.

Am Hof 1
D-53113 Bonn

Horst SEEBASS

Eberhard BONS, *Psalm 31 – Rettung als Paradigma. Eine synchron-
 leserorientierte Analyse* (Frankfurter Theologische Studien 48).
 Frankfurt am Main, Verlag Joseph Knecht, 1994. xii-307 p.
 15,5 × 22,5. DM 68,—

Eberhard Bons is a young Old Testament scholar (b. 1958), who has held a position on the Theological Faculty of Trier since 1987. His monograph is a revised version of his dissertation, presented in 1993, to the Hochschule St. Georgen in Frankfurt. His studies were done at the universities of Mainz, Rome, Tübingen, and Frankfurt.

He argues for the thesis that Ps 31 is a paradigm of deliverance/salvation (*Rettung*). The subtitle of the book indicates that it is “a synchronic reader-oriented analysis”. Bons sets forth a lengthy holistic interpretation of the psalm with extended attention to exegesis, translation, and literary structure. He maintains that the psalm is a literary composition, designed to help the reader/users to reach a state of assurance that their prayers have been heard while they wait for divine intervention to alleviate their troubled situations.

Bons takes his starting point from the polarity between the psalm's prominent place in Christian piety (especially focused on the use of the Greek text of 31,6a in Luke 23,46; the death cry of Jesus on the cross) and the relative neglect and low evaluation of the psalm in critical scholarly works of the past 150 years. Critical analysis has typically resulted in the psalm being considered to be an agglomeration of lament, trust, and praise sections. For example, E. Gerstenberger (*Psalms I* [FOTL 14; Grand Rapids, MI 1988] 137) says bluntly that “All commentators agree that Psalm 31 shows neither logical nor literary order”. He rejects efforts to solve the riddle of the psalm by dividing it into two parts (H. Schmidt) or by assuming that its structure is determined by “the psychology and logic of the life of prayer”, which reflects the movement of the emotions, moods, and thoughts of a person in distress who seeks, and finds, support from God (A. Weiser, *The Psalms* [London 1965] 275). For Gerstenberger, the irregular metrical formation and the ambiguity in content is resolved by liturgical unity, with all the “formal and substantial tensions characteristic of that genre” (137). He defines the psalm as “a genuine complaint song of the individual” (139), with a “firm communal mooring” conveyed by the stress on confidence, thanksgiving and credal statements (especially in vv. 24-25). He concludes that the psalm reflects a life-setting of a congregational worship service of a local community, probably in early Jewish times. He finds no reason to localize the origin of the psalm in the Jerusalem cult. The purpose of the psalm was to foster individual and communal trust in Yahweh. Gerstenberger does observe that the psalm lacks a clear definition of the speaker's misery, its cause, or the means by which the person recovers.

Among other recent commentators, mention may be made of C. Westermann, who says that “Psalm 31 is made up of several psalms that once existed independently” (vv. 2-7, a psalm of trust, vv. 10-19, and individual lament, vv. 8-9.19-25, and individual psalm of praise: *The Living*

Psalms [London 1989] 174). H.-J. Kraus insists on dividing Ps 31 into two parts: vv. 2-9 and vv. 10-25. However, he resists a division of the text into two psalms, noting that “two concurrent parts within a single psalm” occurs in Pss 18, 30, 102, and he suggests that the “use of two phases” was a “well-known phenomenon” (*Psalms 1-59* [Mineapolis, MN 1989] 360).

F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger (*Die Psalmen I* [Würzburg 1993]) read the psalm as a collage of different prayer forms, with elements of lament and description of distress concentrated in its center, with elements of thanksgiving and praise for deliverance concentrated at the beginning (vv. 2-9) and the end (vv. 20-25). A pre-exilic individual lament, found in vv. 10-19, formed the basis of the psalm, to which exilic redaction was added, in vv. 2-9 and 20-25. Hossfeld and Zenger argue that the redaction was closely related to the Jerusalem temple, the place where the privileged ones of Yahweh experienced deliverance.

Such critical assessments constitute the primary rationale for Bons’ work (for his review of critical exegesis of the Psalms, see 2-10). He argues for a holistic literary reading of the psalm, which finds its unity from its literary composition. The disparate entities in the psalm are to be read in relation to one another, even if the composition itself is a later product (10). He seeks for a coherent interpretation, which does not flatten out the diversity of content or explain the wording of the text by introducing elements foreign to the content itself (12). The diversity of contents is to be maintained in the context of a holistic reading.

In order to carry out his objective, Bons subjects the text of Ps 31 to a careful text critical analysis (17-27) and an extensive exegetical analysis of major words and expressions (35-137). He very helpfully provides the reader with a working translation of the psalm (with the Hebrew text) at the end of his introductory chapter (28-31). A retrospective viewpoint is found in vv. 6b.8cd.9.22-23.

Bons divides the literary structure of the psalm into five strophes: vv. 2-5.6-9.10-14.15-21, and 22-25 (228-241). He gives each strophe a close reading and finds internal connections of words, expressions, and poetic devices in each. Among the features of the third strophe (vv. 1-14) there is the use of the *Leitwort* (“distress/enemy”) in vv. 10.12. Also the verb *šš* (“dim”/“weaken”) frames vv. 10 and 11, setting these verses off as a subsection of the larger strophe. This strophe has a structural pattern which may be delineated as follows:

| | |
|-----------|---------------------|
| vv. 10-11 | personal statement |
| v. 12 | relation to others |
| v. 13 | personal statement |
| v. 14 | relation to others. |

Further, there is word association between the “my soul” (*napšî*) in v. 10 and the “distress of my soul” in v. 8 of the preceding strophe, an expression which also uses the *Leitwort* *šār* (*bēšārôt napšî*). “Enemies”, of course, appears in v. 16 of strophe four (vv. 15-21), but a different word is used. Bons (240) says that elements of the first and second strophes, especially, are utilized in the fourth strophe.

Bons also observes that there are language associations and stylistic features which link the whole psalm together. For example, “with you I have taken refuge” (*bēkā yhw hāsītī*) in v. 2 corresponds in form to “for I have called to you” (*qērā’īkā*) in v. 18, as well as the repetition of the verb *hsh* (*hōsīm*), (“those who take refuge with you”) in v. 20, and the use of “be put to shame” in v. 2 (“that I not be put to shame”) and in v. 18 (“that I not be put to shame”, plus the “let the wicked be put to shame”). Bons’ careful reading of the psalm provides good grounds for treating it as a holistic entity, not simply as an agglomeration of discrete parts. However, he warns against the excessive formulation of literary features which can lead to artificial and forced interpretation (240). Ps 31 simply does not manifest a smoothly interlocking poetic structure, though it does not lack coherence.

The most difficult phase of Bons’ argumentation is in his sections dealing with the holistic interpretation of the psalm and the relationship of the “I” (speaker) in the psalm to the reader/user. He compares the ambiguity of verb tense and perspective in the psalm to a kaleidoscope (248), in which parts of a picture take on different colors according to how they are viewed. The perspective for the speaker in the psalm is clearly that of hindsight in vv. 22-25, as v. 23 recalls a statement made in a past distress: “I said in my dismay: ‘I am cut off from before your face’...”. This is a recall of past lament similar to that in Ps 30,9-11. However, Bons contends that vv. 2-21 of Ps 31 cannot be treated as cited speech (248), because a consistent hindsight perspective is foreign to these verses. If this is not the case, how do vv. 2-21 relate to vv. 22-25? Bons works hard to answer this question, but I must confess I find his answer difficult to comprehend. He says that the psalm contains two perspectives: (1) a perspective of looking toward expected deliverance in vv. 2-21 and (2) looking back at deliverance in vv. 23-25.

However, these perspectives never became wholly consistent in the psalm, with two distinct perspectives as if from “diary entries” (249), the first formulated as a complaint of one in distress and the second, a couple of days later, reflecting a deliverance. This would result in two distinct texts from two situations, which is not evident in the psalm. In Bons’ judgement, the problem of perspective is resolved by assuming that the text has been designed to be taken over by a second speaker, the user/reader (*Verwender*) of the psalm, so that the “I” of the psalm encompasses two people: (1) The internal person in the text, who brings together the lament and thanksgiving elements, and whose imagery “writing-situation” is separated from both “life-situations”, and (2) the person who applies the situation of distress in Ps 31 to himself or herself and waits for deliverance (252). The user/speaker is challenged by the “leap” (251) that the psalm makes between the situation of distress and thanksgiving. The user/speaker must, of course, allow the promise of deliverance to prove itself anew, but the psalm points strongly to the *repeatability* of Yahweh’s deliverance. Until the promise becomes reality, the user/speaker has to remain among “those who wait for Yahweh” (v. 25), but assured of being heard.

Bons seems to think the non-concreteness of the language in Ps 31 makes it more amenable for reader use (252-256). He works hard to separate the psalm and the speaker from any explicit and specific life experience and from any cult-functional usage. Efforts to reconstruct an actual *Sitz im Leben* should be given up (243-245). His analysis makes much of the fact that the verb *hsh* ("to take refuge"), while grounded in physical action, is used in the sense of "trust" and "hope". For example, the formally comparable statements in vv. 7 and 15 use "trust" (*bṯh*), and similar examples are found in Pss 16,1.9; 25,2.20; 37,3.5.40 (also the LXX translates *hsh* in Ps 31 as "hope", and does so rather frequently in the Psalter: e.g. 5,11; 16,7; 71,1). The idea of "taking refuge with Yahweh" need have no reference to seeking asylum or redress at the temple in Jerusalem, or at any other sanctuary. Such expressions as "rock" and "fortress" in vv.3-4 are metaphorical, as is "besieged city" in v.22. Specific information about cultic procedures and personnel is lacking as is specificity regarding the desired intervention of Yahweh. The language is generalized, as in most psalms. Bons concludes that the psalm is the product of literary composition, and is not directly related to the actual physical circumstances of the author. The psalm is a work of imagination, a "fictional text" (256-257) in the sense that it goes out beyond experienced reality, but does not leave it completely; overstepping everyday consciousness, and opening up the way to new perception: "a text that arouses identification as does Ps31 cannot reside fully in the area of the ordinary" (256). Thus the text sets forth a paradigm of deliverance and hope.

Bons' book is heavily loaded, perhaps too long and repetitious, and I have not dealt at any length with the wealth of exegetical and analytical detail which he includes. The book contains five excursuses, including one on the common language of the Exodus accounts and Ps 31 (223-228). He also deals briefly with the intertextual relations between Pss 30, 31, 32, and 33, with the use of Ps 31 in the Qumran-Hodayot psalms, its understanding in the LXX, and the use of Ps 31,6a in Luke 23,46.

Bons should be commended for his work in bringing a complex psalm, which is usually neglected, into the mainstream of study and commentary. He is surely correct to play down the cult-fictional aspects of the psalm and to stress its literary nature, although its use in a community worship service of one kind or another should not be excluded. I find it difficult to conclude that repeatability for reader use is dependent on a psalm being a purely literary composition, as Bons seems to think. Of course, if a psalm is too situationally constrained, either in life experience or cult, it would lose capacity for adaptability to new situations. But most psalms are not so specific, and I see no difficulty in some sort of cultic relatedness like that postulated by Gerstenberger (139).

Bons intertextual work on Pss 30-33 should be extended. It seems to me that a case can be made for a ten-psalm collection of Pss 25-34, framed by the acrostic Pss 25 and 34, with a rather concentrated use of key words and phrases, and with a kaleidoscopic interplay of content (a conclusion already presented, in part, by Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalmen I*,

161-162, 211). However, this is not the place to make the intertextual case. I thank Bons for his work, and I look forward to more from him in the future.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Louisville, KY 40280 USA

Marvin E. TATE

Pieter VAN DER LUGT, *Rhetorical Criticism and the Poetry of the Book of Job* (Oudtestamentische Studiën 32). Leiden – New York – Köln, E. J. Brill, 1995. XVI-548 p. 16,5 × 24

Poursuivant la ligne de ses précédentes recherches (*Strofische structuren in de bijbelshereeuwse poëzie* [Kampen 1980]), P. van der Lugt, dans cette étude substantielle et très neuve, explore la structure strophique du poème de Job (3,1-42,6). Bien des essais ont été tentés avant le sien, depuis l'oeuvre du pionnier F. B. Köster (Schleswig 1831). Dans une première partie, l'A. passe en revue les exégètes qui ont poussé leur étude dans cette direction, spécialement ceux qui, dès la fin du XIX^e siècle, se sont souciés d'appuyer leur division en strophes sur des repères formels, entre autres D. H. Müller (Wien 1896), J. Hontheim (Freiburg i.Br. 1904) et N. J. Schlögl (Freiburg i.Br. 1912). D'autres biblistes ont montré peu d'enthousiasme pour l'entreprise. L'A. mentionne, au XX^e siècle, K. Budde (Göttingen 1913), G. B. Gray (London 1915), E. König (Gütersloh 1929) et C. Kuhl, «Neuere Literarkritik des Buches Hiob», *TRu* 21 (1953) 183-185, sans oublier le scepticisme de P. Dhorme (Paris 1926) sur le travail des «bâisseurs de strophes» ni la réserve marquée par des commentateurs récents comme M. H. Pope, R. Gordis, N. C. Habel, D. J. A. Clines et J. E. Hartley.

L'essentiel des recherches de l'A. tient dans les parties II à V (31-444). Après avoir précisé sa méthode d'analyse rhétorique, il étudie l'un après l'autre les discours du livre de Job. Pour chacun il annonce la structure retenue: chaque poème est divisé en «cantos», eux-mêmes subdivisés en «canticles», puis en strophes. Les strophes sont généralement de deux ou trois lignes, parfois de quatre, et même, dans certains cas, d'une seule (3,3.10; 5,1.8.17; 6,14.24; 7,19; 22,12; 24,1.25; 35,4; 37,1.14). Chaque ligne se présente comme un bicola ou un tricola. L'indication de la structure tient en quelques chiffres, par exemple, pour le ch. 3: 8.9.7 1.3.3.1|3.3.3|4.3. Elle est immédiatement suivie du texte hébreu translittéré et structuré en strophes. La typographie choisie permet de placer même les tricola sur une même ligne. Après quelques brèves remarques sur le texte, l'A. donne, non pas une traduction, mais une analyse succincte du contenu de chaque strophe. Viennent alors un relevé très précis des repères de transition (*transition markers*), des récurrences verbales à l'intérieur des strophes, des cantos et du poème entier, puis le rappel des divisions strophiques proposées par une bonne trentaine de chercheurs. Enfin, en quelques pages, l'A. commente et justifie la structure que lui-même retient. Ce commentaire manque seulement pour les discours d'Elihu, que l'A. se réserve d'étudier ultérieurement.

La VI^e partie de l'ouvrage rassemble des observations systématiques sur la macrostructure des différents poèmes, sur la place des tricola dans la structure de la strophe et sur l'importance des repères de transition.

Les exégètes du livre de Job retrouveront l'essentiel des positions de van der Lugt dans la courte VII^e partie: «The Design of the Speech-Cycles» (504-536). Un tableau les schématise (508), que l'A. commente en insistant sur les points les plus sensibles de sa thèse.

Certains aspects de cette thèse vont, effectivement, surprendre le lecteur. L'A. distingue trois cycles de discours, non pas dans les ch. 4 à 27, mais dans l'ensemble des ch. 4 à 41. Le premier cycle (4-14) correspond au découpage traditionnel. Le deuxième, en revanche, déborde largement le ch. 21 et englobe les ch. 25 et 26. L'A. y décèle une structure concentrique. Quant au troisième cycle, il comprend tout le dialogue de Job avec Dieu, soit les ch. 27-31 et 38-41. Il s'agit là d'une addition (que l'A. ne date pas) aux débats de Job et de ses trois amis. Enfin les discours d'Elihu (32-37) constituent une insertion encore plus tardive dans ce même troisième cycle. Le premier et très court échange de Job avec Dieu (40,1-5) prend place, selon l'A., entre le deuxième et le troisième cycles. Cette répartition des masses dans l'ensemble de l'œuvre poétique permet à van der Lugt de compter exactement 280 lignes pour le deuxième cycle et 280 pour le troisième. Pour étayer cette thèse, l'A. s'efforce de montrer successivement que les ch. 25 et 26 marquent la fin du deuxième cycle et que les ch. 27 et 28 représentent le discours introductif du troisième.

Revenons d'abord sur la structure concentrique que l'A. découvre dans le deuxième cycle tel qu'il le reconstitue: (A) Eliphaz (15) et Job (16-17); (B) Bildad (18) et Job (19); (C) Zophar (20) et Job (21); (B') Eliphaz (22) et Job (23); (A') Bildad (24) et Job (25 et 26). Cette structure ne repose pas sur l'ordre d'apparition des interlocuteurs de Job, car la série Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, Eliphaz, Bildad n'offrirait évidemment aucune symétrie. Celle-ci apparaît, selon l'A., dès que l'on s'avise que le deuxième cycle se présente comme un triptyque: ch. 15-19 (A-B); ch. 20-21 (C); ch. 22-26 (B'-A'). Les arguments qu'il avance sont surtout d'ordre thématique. (a) Le passage de Jb 25,4-6 (A') reprend dans le même ordre les trois thèmes de 15,14-16 (A) sur l'impureté foncière de l'homme devant Dieu. De plus les mots *hyl* / *phd*, couplés en 15,20-21(A), se retrouvent en 25,2 et 26,2 (*phd* / *hyl*) et forment «an including chiasm» (ce dernier point paraît moins convaincant). (b) Les déclarations les plus explicites de Job sur le sort de l'homme en Sheol se trouvent en A et A'. (c) Le couple de verbes *hzh* / *r'h*, avec Dieu comme objet, se retrouve en 19,25-27 (B) et en 23,8-9 (B'). (d) Le noyau du cycle (20-21) est marqué par une inclusion: on retrouve la racine *šwb* en 20,2a et 21,34b. On se demande ici si l'A. n'étend pas indûment la notion d'*inclusio*. En effet les mots *yēšibūnī* et *rešūbōtēkem*, peu repérables sémantiquement et auditivement à soixante versets de distance, ne peuvent guère compter comme inclusion.

Cette démonstration, basée sur des remarques intéressantes mais partielles, ne paraît pas ébranler la thèse classique, qui s'appuie, elle, sur une structure formelle très apparente, et qui relie en cycle, aux ch. 15-21, trois discours des amis et trois réponses de Job. Relevons aussi une difficulté de

détail. L'A., en modifiant le TM, met dans la bouche de Job les deux chapitres 25 et 26, introduits par 26,1. Dans cette hypothèse les vv.26,2-4 se trouvent relégués à la fin du canto I, et au milieu de thèmes hymniques qui chantent la redoutable force de Dieu (25,2-3) et l'étendue de son pouvoir cosmique (vv. 5-14). Ceci pose problème, car ces versets où Job s'adresse *au* locuteur précédent (et non pas *aux* amis, 296) constituent nettement une transition entre deux discours.

Concernant les chapitres 27 et 28 qui, dans l'hypothèse, ouvrent le troisième cycle, l'A. tente de montrer qu'ils constituent un discours de Job, préalable à sa rencontre directe avec Dieu, et que ce sont deux poèmes relativement indépendants quant à leur fonction: l'un (27) dévalue et écarte définitivement les arguments des amis, l'autre (28) représente «a testimony of Job's despair». Il est certain que le TM présente le ch.27 comme faisant partie du *māšāl* de Job, et que ce *māšāl* est censé se poursuivre sans interruption au ch.28. Le plaidoyer de l'A. pour l'unité du ch.27 est donc justifié et courageux. Il se heurte à une objection majeure, dont il ne méconnaît pas la force: «It cannot be denied though, that there exists some tension between Job's statement of 27,14-23 and his description of the prosperous life of the wicked in ch.21» (521). Cette tension s'expliquerait, selon l'A., par le fait que le troisième cycle (et donc le ch.27) a été écrit postérieurement par un autre poète, un «wisdom teacher» (534), peu satisfait des réponses apportées dans les deux premiers cycles. On peut se demander toutefois si l'A. a raison de détacher ainsi le ch.27 de l'ensemble 4-26. Si vraiment ce chapitre ouvre un nouveau cycle et «the dialogue between Job and God» (507), pourquoi Job s'adresse-t-il encore à ses amis (vv.5.11.12)? Touchant le ch.27, on peut pointer également un détail qui a son importance. Dans la structure qu'il propose, l'A. inclut le v.13 dans l'ensemble des vv.2-13. Certes *zeh hēleq* a en 20,29 un caractère conclusif; mais il vient dans ce contexte *après* la description du sort des méchants. Ici au contraire, en 27,14-23, la description va suivre; *zeh* est donc nettement un démonstratif annonciateur, et la césure est à faire entre le v.12 et le v.13. D'ailleurs, du point de vue rhétorique, ce v.13 ne saurait être lié à la série de questions que l'on trouve aux vv.8-12.

Avec intrépidité, l'A. transpose 40,1-5, court dialogue de Job et de Dieu, entre ses cycles II et III, juste avant le ch.27. Sans doute a-t-il voulu prévenir une difficulté: sans cette transposition, en effet, Job parlerait sans discontinuer au long de sept chapitres (25-26; 27-31). L'A. tire argument du mot *mwkyh*, en 40,2b; mais la présence de ce terme, même si elle rappelle l'emploi fréquent de la racine *ykḥ* dans les débats entre Job et ses visiteurs, n'implique pas que 40,1-5 doive suivre immédiatement ces discussions.

On sera reconnaissant à PvdL d'avoir tenté une approche vraiment nouvelle de l'économie du livre de Job, et l'on reconnaîtra volontiers qu'il lui était impossible de justifier en quelque trente pages toute sa reconstruction du cycle III. Une telle démonstration nécessiterait tout un arsenal de preuves qui s'enfonceraient très loin dans l'interprétation du texte. Les études récentes sur les chapitres 22 à 27 de Job rappellent la difficulté de l'entreprise. Il faut souvent passer par une nouvelle exégèse des passages difficilement conciliables. Ici aucune traduction ne nous est proposée. Cette ascèse

est louable tant qu'il s'agit uniquement de rechercher des structures sur la base de critères formels; mais quand l'A. tente une présentation inédite de plusieurs chapitres, on aimerait suivre son effort jusqu'au contact direct avec les éléments qui renâclent. Tant que l'on travaille sur des structures, on a affaire à des squelettes relativement dociles. Revêtus de leur chair, les poèmes de Job offrent, en général, une plus forte résistance.

Beaucoup plus fermes sont les «systematic observations» regroupées dans la VI^e partie (456-503). Elles exploitent le patient travail d'analyse poursuivi sur l'ensemble des discours de Job. Comme déjà l'A. peut comparer ces observations avec les résultats de ses analyses antérieures sur la strophique des Psaumes, c'est à bon droit qu'il voit dans ces pages «an Introduction to the Design of Biblical Poetry». Il a pu vérifier à partir du livre de Job la conclusion importante qu'il tirait de son étude des Psaumes: «that the main regularity in the macrostructure of a Hebrew poem is not so much to be looked on the level of the strophes, but rather on that of the cantos and the canticles» (461). En complément de la synthèse sur les tricola, spécialement comme repères de transition, on lit trois pages très suggestives sur le phénomène de l'anacrouse, concrètement: sur l'existence de strophes avec mot(s) et saillie ('projecting word') tels que *hnh*, *'wlm*, *my ytn*, *wy'mr*; et l'on se reportera souvent avec fruit aux excellentes listes de «transition markers» que l'A. a pu enrichir de données statistiques.

On est donc amené, en définitive, à apprécier différemment les thèses de l'A. sur l'architecture générale du livre de Job, qui ne parviennent pas à invalider la répartition en trois cycles des ch. 4-27, et l'immense travail qu'il a consacré à la structure de chaque discours. Ses analyses exhaustives des diverses récurrences, ses statistiques de macrostructure, son repérage des «transition markers» et les structures qu'il propose seront des références obligées pour les exégètes. Désormais les partisans de la structure strophique des poèmes de Job comme ceux qui, légitimement, émettent encore des réserves devront mesurer leurs choix à ceux de van der Lugt. C'est là, pour un chercheur, le plus beau succès.

5, Villa de la Réunion
75016 Paris

Jean LÉVÊQUE, OCD

John J. COLLINS, *Daniel* (Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible). Minneapolis, Augsburg – Fortress Press, 1993. XXXIV-499 p. 21,5 × 24

Hermeneia calls itself 'A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible', and this volume magnificently matches that description. It is undoubtedly the one indispensable commentary on Daniel in English, and, at least until Koch's is completed, in any language. It is impossible to do justice here to the depth and range of discussion that has been incorporated. Nevertheless, Collins deals only with the existing historical-critical questions about Daniel and only with the traditional ones. This commentary neither offers nor provokes any major new issue. To be

fair, Collins has written a good deal on Daniel, the results of which are naturally rehearsed in the commentary. And perhaps it is unreasonable to expect a commentary to be original.

The Introduction, of 122 pages, covers the ancient versions, the problem of language, composition, genres, apocalyptic, and the history of interpretation. The most important recent developments here involve the Old Greek translation, especially in Daniel 3–6: thanks to the publication of all the fragments of Papyrus 967, some new suggestions about the early shape of the book of Daniel are possible, and here Collins's discussion is particularly useful. Whether or not the Old Greek text enables us to reconstruct an alternative Semitic version of the extant MT, the considerable range of evidence available sketches a picture of quickly-evolving textual traditions even after the completion of the book, but with a rapid stabilization of what is now the MT. The Qumran fragments of Daniel not only confirm the switch of language in 2,4, but match the received Hebrew-Aramaic text very closely. By contrast, a continuing mixture of Greek texts is observable well into the early centuries of this era (one wonders of this phenomenon is entirely unrelated to the reception-history of the book's contents, of which more will be said presently). What happened *before* the scroll reached its fullest form(s) remains conjectural, though Collins rehearses his theory that chs 2–6 were originally independent Aramaic tales, perhaps coalescing first into a collection represented by what is now 3,31–6,29 (where the Old Greek differs most notably) and then expanded by the addition of chapter 1 (in Aramaic) early in the Hellenistic period; that chapter 2 was added early in the persecution under Antiochus IV, at which time chs 1–7 may have briefly circulated as an Aramaic book. Finally, according to Collins's reconstruction, chs 8–12 were added between 167 and 164, ch.1 translated into Hebrew and, still before the rededication of the Temple, 12,1–12 attached — with further development and supplementation in the Greek versions thereafter.

This is a plausible enough theory, and in broad outline is surely correct, though placing the composition of ch.1 at a later stage would remove the need to posit an Aramaic original form, and leave one with chs 2–7 as a nicely chiasmic structure, with chs 4 and 5,3 and 6 and 2 and 7 matching closely. However, against the idea of a pre-Maccabean compilation of these chapters is the character of ch. 5, the only one in which the desecration of Temple vessels is present, and the only one in which the arrogance of the king is resolved by his death rather than by his reconciliation to the rule of the Jewish Elyon. Its Maccabean traits are, if not evident, at least highly suggestive. Should one then propose a Maccabean period editing of chs 2–5? Or should we concede that any reconstruction of the history of the book is likely to be oversimplified, especially if it is as unilinear as most theories suppose?

Not surprisingly, given Collins's previous work on Daniel and on apocalypses, the question of genre is treated at length, the stories and visions being considered separately. The label 'court-tale' for the tales (1–6) is defended and 'apocalypse' for the visions (7–12): in this latter case,

the definition of 'apocalypse' developed by Collins in the SBL Pseudepigrapha Group is naturally insisted upon. But one finds here some strange assertions nonetheless: it is assumed, for instance, that because Daniel (like Enoch) is 'one of the earliest exemplars of the apocalyptic genre' its basis may be experiential (58), i.e. the authors of the visions were practising visionaries. This suggestion seems rash for the usually cautious Collins. It is surely unwise to assume that we know of all the possible literary precursors to Jewish apocalypses (of which there are many kinds), but a wide range of possible influences can be instanced: Ezekiel and Zechariah, Akkadian apocalypses and omen lists, Hesiod (or similar Greek texts), Zoroastrian literature, the tales of Daniel themselves... It may be impossible to weigh these influences, but since the composers of the book of Daniel were self-evidently, and indeed by their own characterisation (ch.12), among the educated élite, it seems reasonable to allow that they might have been aware of a range of cultural influences beyond the Jewish writings we now call scriptural.

Indeed, it is unfortunate that the section 'The Origins of Apocalypticism' (occupying less than a page) was not either omitted or considerably expanded. It is possible to deal with the genre 'apocalypse' without invoking this unwieldy and confusing theological/literary/cultural ragbag; but if an examination of the cultural context in which the genres of apocalypse took their shape has a place in a commentary on Daniel, much more than 48 lines should be written on it. But this is not the kind of historical criticism covered by Collins's commentary (a point I shall develop presently). At any rate, apocalypses were not a purely Jewish phenomenon, and explaining Jewish apocalypses in terms of Jewish causes is self-evidently inadequate. Since Collins has written a great deal about the 'apocalyptic vision' and the 'apocalyptic imagination', it is strange that he covers this so cursorily. Has he perhaps changed his mind about the validity of such agendas?

Collins's discussion of the use of Daniel in the Qumran texts will be found very useful. The 4QPrNab text, for instance, confirms the suspicion that independent stories about anonymous Judaeans dealing with less-well-known kings (Nabonidus) became stories about Daniel and the more (in)famous Nebuchadnezzar. At the other end of the process, the Aramaic 4QpsDan (of which part of Milik's translation is printed, p.75) is clearly not an alternative version of the book of Daniel, though Daniel is mentioned, and the composition (unfortunately fragmentary) may or may not be dependent on the book of Daniel as we know it. The much-discussed claim that the Qumran texts do after all reflect belief in resurrection — a belief that *may* have been first explicitly written down in Daniel 12 — surfaced after this commentary was written. As it happens, I agree nevertheless with Collins that the scrolls do not clearly reflect such a belief, and indeed that 4QpsDan, if influenced by Dan 12,2, does not interpret 'rise' as resurrection. I am less convinced that the 'Son of God' text (4Q246) offers an interpretation of the Danielic 'Son of Man'. That particular figure, understandably, enjoys its own Excursus (304-310). Other excursus in the body of the commentary deal with the four kingdoms, the 'Holy Ones' and 'Resurrection'.

The contribution by Adela Yarbro Collins on 'The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament' should not pass unacknowledged. It meets the same high standard as the rest of the commentary. Its justification, however, can only be under the rubric of 'reception history', and, since it is followed by a section on postbiblical developments (up to the present), this is presumably its explicit aim. Given the importance of Daniel throughout the history of the West (and not least in our own day) this section might have been even fuller. At least it should, whatever its length, have made some reference to Jewish interpretation, whose contrast with the Christian tradition of interpretation is instructive. Daniel is surely as much a Jewish as a Christian book. But this is in any case only the most obvious example of the extent to which this is a Christian, and thus sectarian, commentary. To be fair, that is true of the vast majority of commentary series that claim to be 'critical'. One yearns for a good critical Jewish commentary on Daniel. It should look very different. The last word in the body of the commentary ('art') also prompts one to think of what might be done with a thorough *Rezeptionsgeschichte*...

There are some other shortcomings to be mentioned. While virtually every aspect of the recent critical agenda on Daniel has been fully and judiciously covered, two aspects not addressed are arguably also the most interesting and topical: the literary and the sociological. Lack of literary appreciation (I do not mean 'literary-historical') means not only that, for example, the delicious pun on Belshazzar's 'limbs being loosed' (5,6: *wēqitrê ḥarṣēh mištārayin*) and Daniel being a solver of problems (5,16: *wēqitrîn l'miṣrē*) is left unremarked, but that in dealing with matters like the identity of the human figure in ch. 7, or of the Holy Ones, the possibility of multivalence is excluded, while the impact of the symbolism of the animals in chs 7 and 8 on the ancient reader is unconsidered. These shortcomings cannot now, as a decade ago, be excused on the grounds that literary and historical approaches are incommensurate; but even if that were so, the tendency of traditional historical-critical exegesis to reduce what is a fairly sophisticated piece of writing to a set of dogmas about eschatology, angels, and so on, or to imply that the origins of some imagery are its explanations, is not longer good enough. A historical and critical commentary such as this is surely now required to consider matters of the social status and social world-view (I do *not* mean 'apocalyptic worldview') of the implied authors, including historically significant features of the discourse, such as the court setting (earthly and celestial), the aspiration to political office, and the importance of books and writing. It is in dealing with the Greek parts of Daniel (the inclusion of which commends this commentary), especially 'Bel and the Serpent' and 'Susanna' that such literary and social-ideological features might best have been deployed.

A commentary such as this nevertheless takes many years to write, and it would be churlish to criticize either of the Collinses for not reflecting the more recent developments in biblical criticism. I do not mean to excuse Collins totally for a lack of invention or imagination. A very small but significant example of this lack is his comment on p. 1 n. 2 where he says that ben Sira's failure to mention Ezra means his omission of Daniel is not

necessarily significant. There is one inference, surely, to be drawn from the omission of Ezra and Daniel in an otherwise rather full list: that a question mark also lies over Ezra (after all, Nehemiah is mentioned by ben Sira, and in 2 Macc 1–2, whereas Ezra is not).

Indispensable this commentary is, and worthy of acclaim. Despite the annoyingly idiosyncratic Hermeneia format, it must be said that printing errors are few (two random examples are 1 Macc 1,60 on p.1 for 1 Macc 2,60; and ‘Tcherikorver’ in n.534 on p.68). But for all that it is a backward- and not a forward-looking commentary, in both content and method. It deals thoroughly with all the old problems without raising any significant new ones; it opens the way to no new agendas in Daniel research. Some readers will perhaps say that herein lie its greatest virtues! But I wonder how it will wear in the 21st century.

University of Sheffield
GB – Sheffield S10 2UJ

Philip R. DAVIES

Novum Testamentum

Willi BRAUN, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14* (SNTSMS 85).
Cambridge University Press, 1995. XII-221 p. 14,5 × 22,5.
£32.50 – \$49.95

Both the term “social” and the term “rhetoric” are important in the title of this book, for it is a study of Luke 14,1-24 as a composition that uses patterns of ancient rhetoric, challenging social relations associated with elite dinner parties in order to support a different view of group life. By studying this section of Luke as a unitary composition, this book makes important contributions to scholarly method, to our understanding of the healing of the man with dropsy in its context, and to the parable of the great dinner in Luke.

Braun’s study demonstrates the value of a socio-rhetorical approach to the Gospels. Rhetoric not only reflects social relationships and makes use of social assumptions but also serves either to maintain or change established social patterns. Therefore, it is important to ask concerning the social effect of the composition being studied. Braun demonstrates that this can be done in an illuminating way. His key points are well documented by reference to ancient sources.

The scene begins in 14,1 by placing Jesus at a dinner party, and Jesus’ discourse in vv.7-24 relates to this setting. The healing of the man with dropsy, however, seems to have nothing to do with the dinner setting or following discourse. Braun thinks otherwise, pointing to a number of ancient texts in which craving desire for wealth or position is compared to dropsy. Dropsy involves a swelling of the body with excess fluid, accompanied by an insatiable thirst. The more one attempts to quench one’s thirst, the worse the condition becomes. So also with those who have

no control over their desires for wealth and position. According to Braun, the man with dropsy is a symbol of the Pharisees in Jesus' audience, and Jesus in vv. 7-24 goes on to correct their desire for high social position. Thus Jesus is presented as a physician who can cure this social ill. This interpretation has implications for the Lukan characterization of the Pharisees that Braun does not explore. Evidently they are not incurable. Jesus makes the effort to heal their craving desire. Braun demonstrates, then, how the healing of the man with dropsy can be understood as an integral part of the larger scene.

Braun's understanding of the parable of the great dinner in Luke is distinctly different than the dominant one. According to Braun, this story reports the conversion of a member of elite society who, because he is snubbed by his peers, decides to identify with those at the bottom of the social scale. The story is told in order to encourage this choice by persons of prominence and wealth in the Lukan communities. This reading of the parable fits the Lukan context. Those invited to the dinner in v. 21 are the same people that Jesus' host was told to invite in v. 13. Thus the parable reinforces the instruction to invite those at the bottom of society rather than those of high social position. In arguing for his interpretation, Braun might have given more emphasis to the discipleship requirements that follow the parable (vv. 26-33), for the central figure of the parable is turning away from his own social class, which would include family members (cf. v. 12), and is giving away his possessions to the poor (cf. vv. 26, 33). Thus vv. 12-14 and 26-33 form a frame around the parable that supports Braun's interpretation.

Nevertheless, there is a second valid way of reading the parable, a way that the Lukan narrator does not eliminate but rather encourages. The parable is told in response to a remark in v. 15 about eating bread in the kingdom of God. Braun believes that the speaker misunderstands what is at stake. Therefore, Braun does not recognize v. 15 as a clue to interpretation of the following parable. To be sure, the anonymous speaker is not endowed with signs of authority or reliability in the narrative, but neither is there any clear attempt to correct what he says. Furthermore, what he says rings true in the Lukan narrative world. To eat bread in the kingdom of God is indeed a sign of blessedness, and a bit earlier in the narrative Jesus was warning people about the danger of missing this kingdom banquet (13,22-30; see also 22,16.18.30). The fact that the parable is a response to the comment in v. 15 cannot be dismissed as irrelevant to its interpretation. Thus the parable can also be understood as a comment about the kingdom banquet. From this perspective the host of the banquet must be God or the Messiah, and the chief question is who will attend. This is a second — distinctly different — reading of the parable. Yet both are supported by the Lukan context. Thus the parable is multi-voiced in Luke. (See further R. Tannehill, "The Lukan Discourse on Invitations", *The Four Gospels 1992* [ed. F. Van Segbroeck et al.] [BETL 100; Leuven 1992] 1603-1616.)

Braun provides a good discussion of the social effect of events in the parable. Turning down the invitation at the last minute is an insult, and unanimous refusal is an indication of rejection by elite society. Braun asks

whether inviting the poor to dinner was an act of benevolence that would help restore the host's honor. He concludes, rightly, I think, that the host goes beyond benevolence to identification with the outcasts by welcoming them to his home for what was to be a major social event. Thereby the man severs relations with his former peer group and rejects their values (cf. Braun, 116-121). This severance is announced in v. 24, according to Braun. (However, v. 24 remains ambiguous; contrary to Braun's view, it may be an announcement by Jesus about his kingdom banquet.) Braun's careful discussion of the parable of the great dinner also shows that it is not necessary to identify those invited from the city streets and those invited from outside the city with Jewish outcasts and Gentiles, respectively.

In discussing the social situation being addressed by the text, Braun suggests that the evangelist was familiar with the social pressures that surfaced because the Lukan communities were mixing social classes. The Lukan rhetoric confirms and celebrates these mixed gatherings and addresses the situation of wealthier members who might be tempted to back off under the pressure of their families and (former) friends (cf. Braun, 177-180).

Braun recognizes the contribution of scholars who have discussed Luke 14,1-24 as a "symposium", for this genre description suggests the relation of the scene to ancient banquet motifs. Nevertheless, this label is not entirely correct, for the symposium is a macro-genre (while Luke 14,1-24 is a small part of a work that is not a symposium) which contains multi-voiced discourse (while Luke 14,7-24 is almost entirely monologue). It is more accurate to say that the banquet of the rich — a literary motif — stands in the background of this scene (cf. Braun, 136-144). Here Braun provides useful clarification of some of the language being used in current Lukan interpretation.

In studying the scene as rhetoric, Braun seeks to understand how it works as a persuasive argument and to relate it to patterns of argument familiar in ancient rhetoric. These are valid goals that might produce useful results. Braun's specific proposal on this topic, however, is the least successful part of his book.

He rightly notes that there are a number of scenes in Luke that begin with a *chreia* (such as 14,1-6) and include one or more parables (such as 14,16-24). Careful study of the composition and function of these scenes would be useful. Braun's proposal for understanding the composition of Luke 14,1-24 is based on Hermogenes' discussion of the "elaboration" of a *chreia* (see B. Mack in B. Mack – V. Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* [Sonoma, CA 1989] 51-67). In Hermogenes' exercise for his students, the *chreia* supplies a thesis. In the elaboration, students are taught to argue for this thesis using a series of prescribed types of argument, thus developing their skills in oratory. Although there may be some correspondence between Hermogenes' exercise and some synoptic scenes, this explanation of Luke 14,1-24 is not convincing. Braun's interpretation of the dropsical man supports his contention that there is a meaningful connection between the *chreia* in vv. 1-6 and the rest of the scene, but it is not the kind of connection that Hermogenes' pattern requires. The *chreia*

concerns healing on the sabbath, and v. 5 provides the weighty pronouncement that is central in a *chreia*. If a thesis is to be drawn from vv. 2-6, it would concern sabbath healing. Yet this issue is ignored in vv. 7-24. Braun believes that the Lukan narrator is redefining the issue in the *chreia* (Braun, 169), but as a thesis-argument structure the scene works poorly. What is emphasized in the *chreia* does not serve as a thesis for the following discourse. The *chreia* only supplies a symbolic representative of the kind of person Jesus is trying to cure. Here Braun seems to be trying to impose a rhetorical pattern that does not fit Luke 14,1-24.

Nevertheless, most of the book is well-researched, well-argued, and stimulating. Future discussions of Luke 14,1-24 will need to consider Braun's book carefully, and his work may also provide a suggestive pattern for study of other Gospel passages.

960 Braumiller Road
Delaware, OH 43015 USA

Robert TANNEHILL

Gert J. STEYN, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology, 12). Kampen, Kok Pharos, 1995. VIII-290 p. 15 × 23. Dfl 69,90

This work involves a detailed textual study of Luke's use of the Old Testament in Acts and was submitted originally as a doctoral dissertation to the University of Pretoria in 1994. It has undergone only minor revision.

The work begins with a study of the history of research, particularly concerning the use of the LXX in explicit quotations in Luke-Acts at a textual, hermeneutical and methodological level. This survey is well done, and does an excellent job of orienting one to the past work in the field, but concludes rather abruptly without a synthesizing summary, so that it is not entirely clear which key questions the rest of the study will pursue. Steyn raises some of these questions for his second chapter but it leaves his study of the research somewhat detached from his study.

The second chapter discusses the nature of an explicit quotation and their distribution. This chapter discusses the role of speeches in a Greco-Roman context and stresses the function of speeches is to use information rhetorically and kerygmatically and notes how many of the citations occur within the speeches (all but the citation in Acts 8,32-33 [he notes Ps 2,1 in Act 4,25-26, but fails to note it is not speech material]). Of the twenty-five explicit quotations in Acts four come from the Minor prophets, five come from Isaiah, six come from the Psalms, and ten are from the Torah, while most citations occur from within the first fifteen chapters of the book. Nine more texts are not citations, but a "direct phrases", substantial citations lacking an introductory formula. Three of these are from the Psalms and six are from the Torah. Steyn wishes to examine: (1) the origin of Luke's quotations and whether he used a Textvorlage, (2) how he applied the Scripture, and (3) what theological emphases appear in his use of Scripture.

The body of the book examines several of the key speeches in turn (Acts 1,16-20c; 2,14-41; 3,11-26; 13,16-42.48; 22,30-23,9; 28,16-28). The examination is painstakingly thorough. He discusses the context of the speech and its structure, along with noting the debates that accompany the study of the text. There is an assessment of the formulae that introduce the various quotations. The text is then examined in detail at a text critical level, with great competence, along with comparisons between the MT, LXX, and Lucan versions. Any differences are classified into types of differences and assessed one example at a time. The textual consideration also examines how and where the OT passage appears elsewhere in the NT. It is here that judgments are made about whether a *Vorlage* has been used or not. The examination concludes with an assessment of the hermeneutical and theological point of the citation and the changes. The consistency of this approach makes it easy to follow the discussion and the argument.

Steyn argues that most of the citations are the work of Luke in a rhetorical manner, that he used a Greek text form very close to known editions of the LXX. This conclusion is very close to that made by T. Holtz (*Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* [Berlin]) in 1968. Only a few indications point to a text that has contacts with the Hebrew version. Steyn tends to see Luke's hand as very much responsible for the wording and presentation of these speeches and following a text much like LXX^a but stylistically more Semitic in nature. He recognizes that many of the texts Luke uses (e.g., Joel 2,28-32; Ps 110,1; Gen 22,18; Deut 18,15-20; Ps 2,7; Isa 6,9) have a rich tradition in the NT, but sees no indication that Luke had access to written testimonia tradition or that the speech material reflects source material.

Steyn's reading of how the speech tradition is influenced by Greco-Roman forms and custom seems to influence his judgments here. For example, even a text as rich in traditional usage as Isa 6,9-10 is seen as found and applied by Luke in this context as a part of his compositional work. Thus one has the sense that for Steyn Luke has composed the speeches and found the texts, which he places in the mouth of the speakers. This largely rhetorical reading of Luke's approach in the speeches and to his use of the OT seems to underplay significantly the historical function of Luke's work. However, the assurance that Luke wished to give Theophilus was not strictly a rhetorical confidence in the gospel message (Luke 1,1-4). One can argue that Luke has editorially formulated and stylized the speeches, using a text familiar to his audience, but that does not mean that Luke has been uninterested in a speech summary that could have connections to the original event or that Luke could not have access to such information if he wanted to get it. Now it must be admitted that proving these connections is difficult, but the traces of Semitic touches in the citations can serve as such an indication, since it is hard to justify how these touches would end up in the OT text of a writer to a non-Jewish audience. Getting behind a text to sources, beyond identifying their linguistic nature, is always a tricky business, and it often is more influenced by the conventions one suspects are behind the usage than found clearly in hard evidence. Both Steyn's approach and my critique are subject to this

limitation in what we really know. Did Luke write mostly rhetorically or rhetorically-historically? Steyn prefers the former, but a stronger case exists for the latter than Steyn's work suggests.

Luke's use of Scripture has basically two forms: (1) an informative use to point to events already fulfilled, usually with a christological thrust; and (2) a normative use, which points to current or future events, where the Scripture serves to guide or warn in a prophetic style.

Hermeneutically, Luke stresses the theocentric point of view with God always as the subject. So that this thrust is more important than christology. Peter and Paul serve as prophetic mouthpieces of the Spirit who can quote the Scripture and can interpret it as well. For Luke, the Scripture lays out a salvation-historical perspective that shows how the events tied to Jesus provide for the salvation, not only of Jews but of non-Jews as well. So the Scripture has a kerygmatic function, showing how God's plan of salvation is taking place. Luke highlights the divine plan, pneumatological empowerment in the prophetic mission, the christological arbitration along with the Jesus kerygma, and an eschatological dimension in which the last days have come and one can look forward to the restoration of all things.

In the use of Scripture and in the hermeneutics, the categories applied are so broad that the discussion is not as helpful as the text critical analysis was. This is seen perhaps most clearly in the debate about whether the use of the OT is primarily eschatological or christological (i.e., in Acts 2 and the use of Joel 2,28-32) or theological versus christological in the citations considered as a whole (see 237). Here is a case where either/or is not what is present in Luke's presentation but a both/and. Steyn points out correctly that God is the acting subject in these OT texts. But it should not be overlooked that God is seen as acting through Jesus. It is Jesus who is raised by God and Jesus who distributes the Spirit indicating the arrival of the eschaton. Luke's use of Scripture is theocentric, but in a very special sense — it is God acting through Jesus, and it is the Jesus element of that action that is the cause of offense and that produces the need for Luke's defense of the gospel. If God were not acting through this one in this way, then there would be no reason to cite the OT to explain how God was working through this one. This means that recent discussion of Luke's use of the Old Testament that has tried to force a choice between a theocentric or eschatological primacy in Luke's use of Scripture versus a christological one is misguided in putting asunder what Luke wants the reader to see as belonging together. What God has done through Jesus is Luke's point in citing Scripture as he does.

A disappointment in the study was Steyn's failure to address the "proof from prophecy" debate in any detail at a hermeneutical level. This discussion has been an ongoing one in the hermeneutical study of Luke with P. Schubert opting for a proof from prophecy emphasis in 1954 ("The Structure and Significance of Luke 24", *Neutestamentliche Studien* [Hrsg. W. Eltester] [BZNW 21; Berlin 1959]) 165-186, while M. Rese vigorously challenged this approach in 1969 (*Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* [Studien zum Neuen Testament 1; Gütersloh 1969]).

The debate has not died out since, but there is little concrete indication in the study where Steyn falls in this discussion. This means that the hermeneutical discussion has numerous helpful observations at the individual level, but lacks a synthesis and a clear indication of where the study fits in the technical discussion.

The work comes without an index and also has a few locations where paragraphs appear to be misplaced (91, 194), as well as a few typos (173, 182, 191, 211).

In sum, Steyn's study is a fine technical examination of Luke's use of the OT at a textual level. For this it should and must be consulted. It is less satisfying as a study of his hermeneutical approach once one moves beyond individual observations to what the central perspectives of Luke were in handling the text.

3909 Swiss Ave
Dallas, TX 75204 USA

Darrell L. BOCK

Juan Miguel DÍAZ-RODELAS, *Pablo y la ley. La novedad de Rom 7,7-8,4 en el conjunto de la reflexión paulina sobre la ley* (Institución San Jerónimo 28). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1994. 282 p. 16 × 24

Il titolo indica chiaramente argomento e prospettiva dello studio: nel quadro di ciò che Paolo dice della Legge, evidenziare l'apporto di Rm 7,7-8,4, ritenuto di rilevante novità. Di fatto esso si occupa di 1 Cor 9,19-23; 15,56; Gal 2,16-4,7; Rm 2,12-7,6, testi analizzati meno approfonditamente e che costituiscono il termine di paragone per valutare Rm 7,7-8,4, la sezione oggetto di studio primario. In concreto, tre sono le parti: analisi dei testi circa la Legge di 1 Cor, Gal e Rm 2,12-7,6 (15-120); studio di Rm 7,7-8,4, parte centrale (121-210); terza parte, di carattere conclusivo (211-231), «en la que presentaremos de forma más sistemática los elementos de novedad que Rom 7,7-8,4 aportan en el conjunto de la reflexión paulina sobre la Ley» (14). L'opera riproduce «casi íntegramente» (14) la tesi di dottorato in scienze bibliche sostenuta nel 1993 presso il Pontificio Istituto Biblico di Roma, con A. Vanhoye direttore e J.-N. Aletti nelle vesti di secondo relatore. L'autore è attualmente professore di Nuovo Testamento nella facoltà di teologia di Valencia.

Nell'introduzione Díaz-Rodelas precisa che il lavoro è «fundamentalmente exegético»; si tratta di un'analisi del testo in tutte le sue dimensioni: «crítica textual, filología, aspectos gramaticales, disposición retórica, posibles estructuras y recursos estilísticos mayores y menores»; il testo è da situare nel suo contesto letterario (13). Scorrendo la ricerca ci si accorge facilmente che questa impostazione metodologica è stata accuratamente seguita nell'attenzione minuziosa e intelligente allo spessore letterario delle pagine paoline. Solo non si può non rilevare che manca del tutto lo studio del contesto storico, cioè della collocazione del testo nel quadro dei rapporti che legavano l'autore ai destinatari. Si tratta infatti di letteratura epistolare e la

comunicazione tra mittente e interlocutori esige che sia chiarita, per quanto è possibile, la loro situazione di dialoganti. Certo, l'autore della ricerca può limitarsi a uno studio di puro carattere letterario, ma in questo modo, per un verso, si pregiudica una prospettiva che facilita la comprensione del testo, per l'altro non credo che un'unilaterale attenzione allo spessore letterario del testo, con esclusione della sua collocazione storica, possa essere dichiarata *sic et simpliciter* «fondamentalmente esegetica». E sempre da questo punto di vista si rileva che, se è pur vero che qua e là l'autore annota la novità del giudizio teologico di Paolo sulla Legge rispetto alla valutazione del mondo giudaico del tempo, in realtà manca un serio lavoro di tipo comparativistico.

Venendo ora a esaminare la lettura dei singoli testi, incontriamo anzitutto una breve presentazione di 1 Cor 9,19-23, in cui Paolo dice di non essere *hypo nomon*, ma neppure un *anomos theou*, perché è un *ennomos Christou*; evita così di far equivalere il non essere sotto la Legge all'essere un fuorilegge davanti a Dio. Da parte sua 1 Cor 15,56 sottolinea una duplice correlazione morte-peccato e peccato-Legge. E qui Díaz-Rodelas afferma che il v. s'inquadra bene nel contesto del cap. 15 (27), una valutazione contestabile, riteniamo, visto che in tutto il cap. 15 è del tutto assente il tema del peccato (*hē hamartia* al singolare) e altrettanto si dica della Legge. Del resto anche ultimamente non è mancato chi l'ha ritenuto una glossa successiva, forse di mano dello stesso Paolo (cf. F. W. Horn, «1 Korinther 15,56 – ein exegetischer Stachel», *ZNW* 82 [1991] 88-105).

Nella trattazione del tema in Gal l'autore sottolinea i diversi aspetti del problema. Anzitutto Paolo passa da «opere della Legge», formula indicativa delle leggi di purezza rituale, alla Legge stessa, ritenuta via non praticabile ai fini della giustificazione. La legge viene esclusa non solo a causa del valore della fede in ordine alla giustificazione, ma soprattutto perché si riferisce al fare, che racchiude il soggetto in se stesso (62). La valutazione della Legge poi è quanto mai negativa perché fonte di maledizione (3,10a), posteriore ed estranea alle promesse salvifiche di Dio giurate ad Abramo e alla sua discendenza (3,15-18), in qualche modo distante da Dio (3,19b-20), incapace di dare la vita in pienezza (3,21-22), accostata al peccato, al quale si orienta (3,19b), elemento di costrizione e ambito di schiavitù (3,23-25), essa stessa fattore schiavizzante (4,1-7). I passi paolini di ben nota difficoltà interpretativa potrebbero, in realtà, ricevere maggior luce da una chiarificazione dell'oggetto della contesa che opponeva Paolo ai «giudaizzanti» della Galazia. Ma l'autore si occupa solo del testo preso nella sua «materialità» e oggettività.

Nella lettura di Rm 2,12-7,6 Díaz-Rodelas ha modo di rilevare una fondamentale continuità con Gal quanto alla valutazione della Legge. Se in 2,12-29 l'intento vero di Paolo è di «livellare tutti gli uomini, giudei e gentili» (91), in 3,21-29 egli sottolinea che nessuno può raggiungere la giustificazione *operibus Legis* e che l'uomo è giustificato per fede *sine operibus Legis*; ma poi l'apostolo mette in stretto legame la Legge, l'ira divina e la trasgressione (4,15) e afferma che la Legge «moltiplica el pecado» (Rm 5,20a); soprattutto sottolinea che il cristiano non sta sotto la Legge, ma sotto la grazia, perché liberato da Cristo (cap. 6 e 7,1-6).

L'analisi di Rm 7,7-8,4 è assai minuziosa e condotta con lodevole impegno. «La novedad de 7,7-25 consiste en que este pasaje aborda el tema della Ley en cuanto tal» (123), trattando soprattutto in che senso si devono intendere, nel loro rapporto, Legge e peccato. In concreto, Paolo risponde in modo molto argomentato all'interrogativo di 7,7: «La Legge è peccato?». La risposta dell'apostolo è che la Legge non è peccato, però è strumento in mano al peccato per condurre l'uomo alla morte. In se stessa è santa, giusta e buona, addirittura «spirituale», ma è stata strumentalizzata dal peccato per condurre l'«io» alla perdizione. E qui Díaz-Rodelas ritiene che Paolo allarghi il discorso all'umanità intera e proponga un concetto più largo di legge, capace di abbracciare in senso generale il volere normativo di Dio ed estendersi alla legge della mente umana (172-174). Parallelamente l'autore offre la seguente soluzione al problema dell'identità del misterioso «io» del cap. 7: «el "yo" comprende a Pablo, a cualquier judío y a cualquier ser humano antes de haber recibido los efectos de la salvación ofrecida en Cristo» (191); e poco dopo si esprime in modo ancor più completo: «l'io di Rom 7,7-25 si riferisce sempre allo stesso soggetto, considerato nelle stesse circostanze: è l'uomo, qualunque uomo, che contempla come diventa la prima vittima dell'utilizzazione della Legge a causa del peccato; qualunque uomo, che, nel suo incontro con la Legge, sperimenta le terribili conseguenze della forza del peccato, che fa della Legge santa, buona e orientata alla vita, uno strumento di morte» (191).

In Rm 8,1-4, che l'autore ritiene collegato tematicamente a 7,7-25, egli trova una presentazione complementare e insieme antitetica al contenuto di questo brano: se la Legge non possiede alcuna capacità in ordine alla salvezza, nello stesso tempo è rivendicata la necessità di adeguarsi alla sua esigenza come espressione della volontà di Dio, ciò che è possibile all'uomo liberato per virtù di Cristo dal peso condizionante e frustrante del peccato e dalla sua destinazione alla morte eterna. Un compimento della Legge in forza dello Spirito. E qui l'autore vede la chiave di lettura del difficile 3,31b: la dottrina della giustificazione per fede non solo non suppone l'abolizione della Legge, ma anzi la conferma.

Nella parte conclusiva Díaz-Rodelas afferma che quanto al tema della Legge Rm 7,7-8,4 costituisce una rilevante novità non solo rispetto a 1 Cor e Gal, ma anche a Rm 2,12-7,6, che da parte sua si pone in continuità sostanziale con la presentazione assai negativa di Gal; anzi Rm 3,20b; 4,15; 5,13-20a e 7,5 sono testi che circa il rapporto Legge-peccato si presentano ancor più negativi che non la visione di Gal: la Legge sta dalla parte del peccato (225). In concreto, Paolo opera un «replanteamiento de las relaciones Ley-pecado» (225). Anzitutto, la morte dell'io ha come causa il peccato, «único generador de muerte» (226), mentre la Legge è solo strumento in mano al peccato. Secondo, la Legge è santa e spirituale, cioè in rapporto con lo Spirito; dunque Paolo ne sottolinea qui la natura divina. Terzo, si rivendica della necessaria obbedienza alla Legge.

Si potrebbe discutere questo o quel punto della lettura dell'autore; ma vorrei di nuovo soffermarmi sul metodo. Egli conclude così: «Le affermazioni di Rom 7,7-8,4 non significano, pertanto, una rottura con quanto è stato affermato in 1 Corinti, Galati e Rom 2,12-7,6. Però di fronte a questi

scritti esse rappresentano una novità, che, vista alla luce di Rom 2,12-7,6, deve qualificarsi come inusitata. Il testo che abbiamo fatto oggetto del nostro studio può considerarsi l'ultima tappa di un cammino lungo e difficile» (231). E poco prima spiega la diversità tra Gal e Rom 7,7-8,4 in base alla situazione affrontata: «l'asserto di Rom 7,12 'la Legge è santa e il comandamento santo, giusto e buono' sarebbe stato inimmaginabile nella lettera ai Galati, la cui composizione fu motivata dalla necessità di far fronte alla considerazione dell'assoggettamento alla Legge come elemento indispensabile per poter partecipare ai beni salvifici» (230); «ciò fu solo possibile nello scritto curato che l'apostolo dicesse ai cristiani di Roma come lettera di presentazione» (230). Ci si domanda perché mai Díaz-Rodelas non abbia sentito il bisogno di dedicare un'adeguata trattazione al contesto storico degli scritti paolini, se poi nell'ultima pagina giunge a riconoscerli il fattore che ha causato i diversi punti di vista della presentazione paolina della Legge.

Vorrei comunque concludere con una parola di sincero elogio per un lavoro stimolante e capace di suscitare interrogativi, per es. a proposito della domanda di Rm 7,7: «La legge è peccato?». Il problema sollevato e la soluzione offerta dall'apostolo troverebbero fasci di luce dallo studio del contesto storico. Concretamente, conveniva indagare perché le affermazioni scandalose di Gal circa la Legge avevano fatto nascere obiezioni e critiche e Paolo aveva sentito la necessità di spiegarsi calibrando un po' meglio le sue prese di posizione.

Via del Pellegrino, 113
I-00186 Roma

Giuseppe BARBAGLIO

José O'CALLAGHAN, *Los primeros testimonios del Nuevo Testamento. Papirología neotestamentaria* (En los orígenes del cristianismo 7). Córdoba, Ediciones El Almendro, 1995. 149 p. 16 × 24. Ptas 2.700

In this book J. O'Callaghan describes the task of New Testament textual criticism, and especially the place that papyrus copies of New Testament books play in that task. Papyrus texts are not as numerous as those preserved on parchment, numbering only 99, and most of them are fragmentary. Only a few preserve the bulk of a New Testament book (e.g. P⁶⁶ [Papyrus Bodmer II] has most of John's Gospel; P⁷⁵ [Papyrus Bodmer XIV], much of the Lucan Gospel; P⁷⁴ [Papyrus Bodmer XVII], much of Acts). The papyrus texts, however, are important, because many of them are older than parchment copies, the earliest of which dates only from the fourth century. The earliest papyrus fragment, P⁵² (Rylands Papyrus, preserving John 18,31-33.37-38), is dated ca. AD 125. Several papyrus texts come from the second century (P⁶⁴ + ⁶⁷, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁷, P⁹⁰, P⁹⁸), and about thirty of them date from the third century. This is why O'Callaghan rightly entitles his book *Los primeros testimonios del Nuevo Testamento*.

O'Callaghan's treatment of papyrus New Testament texts falls into three chapters: (I) Papyrology; (II) Papyri of the New Testament; and (III)

Problems in New Testament Papyri. To these chapters he adds an epilogue devoted to two papyrus fragments found in Qumran Cave 7, claimed to be of New Testament writings.

Chapter I has two parts, "La papirología", which describes what papyrus is and how it was used in antiquity, among other things, as writing material. As such, its use is traced to about 3000 BC in Pharaonic Egypt and continued down to the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Greek texts written on papyrus appear from the fourth century BC on; the thousands of them recovered from Egypt preserve all sorts of texts, literary, legal, imperial, official, and biblical. At first, such texts were written on papyrus in the form of a scroll, but in time (end of the first century AD) they took the form of a codex, in an effort to utilize more of the precious papyrus and to facilitate the handling of texts. The second part, "La ciencia de los papiros", is devoted to the modern study of papyrus texts, Greek and Coptic, which came to light since the Napoleonic Expedition to Egypt (1798). At the end of the nineteenth century (especially 1877-1878) thousands of papyri were brought to Austria, Belgium, England, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain, and Sweden; the study of them became what O'Callaghan calls "la ciencia".

Chapter II, "Los papiros del Nuevo Testamento", recounts how it took time to establish the official list of papyrus New Testament texts. It began with the work of E. von Dobschütz (1924), was revived by E. Brady (1947), corrected by G. Maldfeld and B.M. Metzger (1949), and completed by K. Aland (1976) and J.K. Elliott (1989). Then O'Callaghan gives not only the list of the papyrus texts, indicating their date, *editio princeps*, and contents, but also a list showing the chapters and verses of each New Testament book represented in 98 texts. Only 1-2 Timothy are without papyrus copies. Finally, O'Callaghan discusses the value of the principal papyrus texts: Chester Beatty, Bodmer, Rylands, and others.

Chapter III, "Problemas en torno a los papiros neotestamentarios", discusses the textual family-types represented in the papyri: they belong to the Alexandrian, Antiochene, Caesarean, and Western recensions. Then the problem of *nomina sacra* is taken up: What they are and how they were written. Finally, the codex form of New Testament papyrus texts is treated. O'Callaghan recognizes that this form was first developed for pagan authors and not for Christian or biblical writings, as is often thought, even though the Christian adoption of it rapidly spread its use.

In general, what O'Callaghan has written in the main part of the book is commendable and well presented. The list of 98 papyri (29-41), however, has some details that are not clear or should have been corrected. For instance, it gives the impression that P⁶⁷ (PBarc. inv. 1) was first published by C.H. Roberts in 1953, whereas it was first published in 1956, as O'Callaghan notes (75); the 1956 article of R. Roca-Puig should be listed under P⁶⁷. Of P⁸³ and P⁸⁴ it is said, "En vías de publicación", whereas N-A²⁷ notes about them: "Louvain, Bibl. de l'Univ., P.A.M. Kh. Mird. 16.29" and "...4.11.16.27". More crucial, however, is the erroneous content given for P⁸³, which repeats the line above, thus giving as its content that of P⁸². What is given for P⁸⁴ is actually the content of P⁸³ (but

correct 23,29 to read 23,39); and the content of P⁸⁴ should be Mc 2,2-5.8-9; 6,30-31.33-34.36-37.39-41; Jn 5,5; 17,3.7-8. Moreover, P⁹⁹ should have been listed, a Chester Beatty Papyrus, dated ca. 400, which gives a Graeco-Latin Lexicon for various Pauline letters (see A. Wouters, *The Chester Beatty Codex Ac. 1499* [Chester Beatty Monographs 12; Leuven – Paris 1988]).

The list on page 29 (end of n. 10) is misleading. It claims that what is first given for a text is the dates of N-A²⁷ (with that of N-A²⁶ in parentheses). Actually it is the other way round. For P⁷, N-A²⁷ gives III-IV? (which now stands in parentheses), and not IV-V?; for P⁷³, N-A²⁷ gives VII (which now stands in parentheses), and not ?. The same has to be said for the list of contents of different papyri which follows in the note.

In the chart on page 68 the heading of the second column should read “N.º de versículos del libro”, not “del Evangelio”; more than Gospels appear in the list under that heading.

In the epilogue (95-145) O’Callaghan returns to a controversial question, the identification of two papyrus fragments from Qumran Cave 7 that he published in 1972 (*Bib* 53 [1972] 91-100, 362-367, 513-533). There he claimed that 7Q5 was part of Mark 6,52-53, and 7Q4, part of 1 Tim 3,16; 4,1.3. Now in the epilogue of this book, O’Callaghan briefly recounts the discovery of the Qumran caves and of manuscripts and fragments in them. He concentrates on Cave 7 and the fragments it yielded: all nineteen written in Greek, none in Aramaic or Hebrew, and all on one side of the papyrus, hence fragments of papyrus scrolls, not codices.

In his discussion of 7Q5, O’Callaghan not only reiterates the arguments formulated earlier to support his identification of it as Mark 6,52-53, but now invokes the enlarged photograph of the fragment made by the Division of Identification and Forensic Science of the Israel National Police in 1992, published in B. Mayer (ed.), *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (Eichstätter Studien NS 32; Regensburg 1992) 243, to maintain that the fourth letter on line 2 is indeed a *ny*, and not an *iota*, as others had contended. He considers the attempts of others to identify 7Q5 with Exod 36,10-11 (P. Garnet); 2 Sam 4,12-5,1; 2 Sam 5,13-14 (C.H. Roberts); Zech 7,4-5 (M.V. Spottorno); Matt 1,2-3 (P. Parker); Luke 3,19-21 (K. Aland) to be more problematic than his own identification. He claims, moreover, that computer-searches of all of Greek literature carried out in Liverpool, for the combination of letters as he read them, “solamente confirmaron Mc 6,52-53” (116). Finally, he includes a statistical study of probabilities written by a mathematician, A. Dou (“El calculo de probabilidades y las posibles identificaciones de 7Q5”, 116-139), which he claims supports his contention. Then O’Callaghan concludes with a similar discussion of 7Q4, reiterating his arguments for its identification as 1 Tim 3,16; 4,1.3 and rejecting attempts of others to identify it with Num 14,23-24 (G.D. Fee); Num 14,23-24 (A.C. Urban); Job 34,12-15; 1 Enoch 103,3-4 (G.W. Nebe).

On p. 107 O’Callaghan reproduces an enlarged photograph of 7Q5 with the date “ca. año 50 d.C.”. That date he takes from the *editio princeps*, which M. Baillet, original editor of the fragment, derived from C.H. Roberts, prior to and independently of the subsequent controversy. Everyone knows, however, that such palaeographic datings are always

subject to a margin of error (± 25 -50 years). Even if one were to grant that 7Q5 were part of Mark 6,52-53, how did it come to be deposited in Cave 7 before the destruction of the community center at Khirbet Qumran (summer AD 68)? Many New Testament scholars date the composition of Mark ca. AD 65. If that is correct, a copy of it possibly came shortly thereafter to Christians in Jerusalem, who knew Essenes of Qumran and brought the copy to one of their caves. That is not impossible, but such a solution is problematic for many reasons. No one knows when those Greek fragments were deposited in Cave 7. They might have been deposited there some time after the destruction of the community center and the abandonment of it by the Essenes, just as the so-called Copper Scroll seems to have been deposited in Cave 3 ca. AD 100, long after the Essene community ceased to use that cave. All of that, however, is hypothetical and problematic.

Since the publication of this book, three further studies of 7Q5 have appeared in *RB* 102 (1995). They are all negative and, in my opinion, successfully demolish O'Callaghan's claim. The careful palaeographic analysis of the fragment by E. Puech (570-584) shows that one cannot read $\alpha\lambda\beta\tau\omega\nu\ \eta\iota$ in line 2, as O'Callaghan would have it. On the Israeli enlarged photograph, what seems like the oblique stroke coming from the top-left shaft of the letter claimed to be $\eta\iota$ is shown by Puech to be nothing more than a shadow. Moreover, there is no trace of the right side of the alleged $\eta\iota$ and not even space for it, before one reads the bottom of the following damaged *alpha*, which O'Callaghan fails to read correctly. What he claims is $\text{I}\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\iota$ in line 3 is more plausibly read as $\text{I}\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega$. Consequently, Puech concludes that the identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6,52-53 is "totalement impossible" (570). To Puech's criticism, M.-E. Boismard adds further remarks (585-588), showing that line 3 alone of the fragment encounters three major anomalies, with which O'Callaghan has not fully reckoned: the faulty reading $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\iota$ instead of $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega$ or $\tau\omega$; the interpretation of τ as δ ; and the omission of $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\nu\ \gamma\eta\nu$. Even though O'Callaghan sought to justify or explain these anomalies, Boismard shows that his explanations are inadequate. Finally, P. Grelot criticizes the popularization of O'Callaghan's ideas by C. P. Thiede (589-591). When one reads three such negative assessments, one recognizes that O'Callaghan's proclaimed identification of 7Q5 as a Marcan fragment has encountered only reluctant scholarly ears.

Lastly, it should be noted that the application of mathematical probabilities to a literary question like this may be completely askew. As I read the pages contributed by the mathematician A. Dou, I could not help but recall an earlier similar attempt made by J. Albertson, "An Application of Mathematical Probability to Manuscript Discoveries", *JBL* 78 (1959) 133-141. Albertson tried to show thereby that the omission of the so-called Parables from Qumran copies of the Book of Enoch could not have been the result of chance: that the Parables "did *not* exist at the time the Qumran MSS were copied is better as an explanation of the MS distribution than is the contradictory hypothesis" (140 [his emphasis]). Albertson's article evoked a reply by H. E. Robbins, of the department of

Mathematical Statistics of Columbia University, "Comments on a Paper by James Albertson", *JBL* 78 (1959) 347-350. Robbins maintained that in Albertson's article "the wrong sort of hypothesis is being tested by an incorrect statistical criterion based on a false assumption of the nature of the probability distribution in question. Few examples in the literature excel [Albertson's article] in these respects, and it would be excellent as a cautionary example for classes in introductory statistical inference" (350). Perhaps someone mathematically more competent than I might come to a similar analysis of the statistical probabilities to which O'Callaghan is making appeal.

The upshot is that O'Callaghan has not yet proved that 7Q5 should be listed as P¹⁰⁰!

The Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064 USA

Joseph A. FITZMYER, SJ

William L. PETERSEN, *Tatian's Diatessaron. Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, & History in Scholarship* (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 25). Leiden – New York – Köln, E. J. Brill, 1994. XIX-555 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl. 220.00 – \$125.00

The most helpful introductions to the Diatessaron were up to now the monographs by Theodor Zahn (Erlangen 1881) and Curt Peters (Rome 1939). Both these works have been superseded by this new voluminous monograph by William Petersen of Penn State University. Petersen was a student of Prof. Dr. Gillis Quispel of the University of Utrecht, under whose guidance he wrote a dissertation about the Diatessaron and Ephrem Syrus as Sources of Romanos the Melodist (1984), which was honoured with a place in the CSCO series (Subs. 74; Louvain 1985). Petersen has been engaged in textual studies especially dealing with the second century text in the patristic sources (a.o. Justin and Tatian).

Long ago I had myself the urge to write a history of Diatessaron research, but I am now glad that I never succeeded in my plans, because Petersen has given us a really magnificent survey of the research and discoveries, and so created a magnificent book that ought to be on the shelves of every library. The book is indispensable for everyone who is interested in textual criticism and the early history of the transmission of the Gospel text. I congratulate the author for this masterpiece of scholarly research, which despite the difficulty of the topic has been written in an easy and lucid style. Petersen's book has a clear structure. His Introduction (1-8) presents the reader with the reasons for his study and for the way in which he has offered the material. From the outset (1-2) he confronts the reader with one of his theses, namely that Tatian might have incorporated a harmony of the Synoptics made by Justin (cf. 27-29, 346-356, 423-424, 440).

Chapter I deals with the second-century background to Tatian's harmony. The question of the Western Text and its contribution to the history of the early text of the Gospels has been amply discussed, and in

that connection the author discusses some examples such as the light at the baptism of Jesus, as preserved in Justin, in the Gospel used by the Ebionites, some Old Latin manuscripts of Matthew, the Sibylline Oracles, and the Diatessaron tradition (14-22). Petersen's careful conclusions are a challenge to modern textual critics. He concludes this chapter with a survey of other early harmonies.

Chapter II deals with the Patristic references to Tatian's harmony, from Eusebius to Maris ibn Sulaiman, including an English translation of Victor of Capua's Preface to the Codex Fuldensis (35-67). Petersen deals with the autobiographic observations in Tatian's Oration to the Greeks in relation to the patristic notices about Tatian, on the basis of which he presents a sketchy survey of Tatian's life (67-72). He then deals with the impact which Tatian's theological presuppositions might have had on his Diatessaron (72-83).

Chapters III-VI form the main body of this monograph (no less than 273 pages). They inform us about the history of research from Victor of Capua to Boismard, in such a way that both the texts that are involved and the theories that have been developed are thoroughly discussed. Together with the first Appendix, "A Catalogue of Manuscripts of Diatessaronic Witnesses and Related Works" (445-489) and the immense bibliography (491-521), they offer students of the intriguing Diatessaron problem a real treasure for future research. Every reader will be impressed by the author's immense knowledge of pertinent literature and by his eagerness to do justice to anyone who has dealt with the complicated problems of the study of the Diatessaron. His criticisms of others are usually very mild. The choice of dealing with the history of research in this chronological way has its advantages. The reader gets a good insight into the progress of research and the succession of new discoveries. The disadvantage is that the reader lacks a more systematic and thematic approach. The *indices* (523-555), however, are complete and therefore very helpful.

Chapter VII "Using the Diatessaron" is a jewel. Petersen deals with the possibilities and dangers of Diatessaron research. How, in face of the complexity of the Diatessaron traditions in the East and the West, can we determine that a "variant" is really part of the original Diatessaron? Many of his warnings (357-368) are most useful, not only for Diatessaron research, but for textual criticism as a whole. However, Petersen not only sets out the problems and pitfalls, but he also tries to give principles with which the student may attempt to recover the original Diatessaron text. First of all, he summarizes and comments upon 7 "logical" principles (368-373), which seems to me quite convincing. The three criteria which he develops "for determining the probability that a variant is Diatessaronic" (373-377) seem more problematic to me; but Petersen shows himself open to any criticism of these rules, while still — correctly — holding to the view that we need some rules of thumb that can at least preclude wrong conclusions for determining the original Diatessaron text. It was a very good thing that Petersen offered a series of "exhibits" to show how one may apply the rules that he proposed. One example shows how his criteria "can screen out dubious readings" (378-379), and eight others present

readings “which have a high probability of being Diatessaronic” (379-424). Whether each of these exhibits can convince the reader is difficult to say, but one becomes fascinated by the logic of Petersen’s reasoning.

Petersen’s aim is not only to look back at all the achievements of the past, but also to stimulate future research. He describes several issues and questions that require a more thorough study (438-444): this is a vast area of research which deserves the attention of young students when they are planning their dissertation, such as the study of the Manichaean documents. What is missing here is the renewed question of the original language of the Diatessaron. In his survey of the research this question comes up several times. Was it Greek, Syriac, or even Latin? Petersen suggests that this problem is now settled (428) on the basis of internal evidence. In some of his exhibits he makes a plea for the Syriac origin: “...if the Diatessaron were originally composed in Greek, ... then it would be inexplicable...” (cf. e.g. 397). In the sixth of his seven logical principles, however, he states: “In order to remain on a sound methodological footing, Diatessaronic research must always begin with the assumption that (1) the original text was composed in Greek...” (369). This seems somewhat confusing. Theoretically, there is no need to assume that the author is contradicting himself. His purpose is apparently to establish the fact that Tatian worked with Greek texts when he composed his Diatessaron, so that the basis of comparison should be the Greek text. Did Petersen definitively solve the language question when he ultimately opted for Syriac? I do not think so. Personally I favour the view that the first draft was in Greek perhaps as a text book used in the school at Rome whose rector Tatian had become after the martyrdom of Justin. The Syriac Diatessaron might be a version of this text, whereas the Latin Diatessaron was a version either of the Greek text or rather of the Syriac version. But this is just an opinion among others. Before the problem of the original language can be wholly settled, a painstaking research is necessary, not just of selected readings, but of *all* the material that we have. One should proceed along two lines: 1. The collection and comparison of all the oriental Diatessaron traditions; 2. The collection and comparison of the western Diatessaron traditions. Only if all this work is done, can we be able to discover the intrinsic relationship between the two different traditions, and perhaps their respective relationship with a possible Greek harmony. This huge work can now be done with the help of the detailed compendium that Petersen has given us.

Of course, in such a large work as Petersen wrote, the danger always exists that some flaws creep into the text. For example, one should read: *brmt*, “in excelsis” (387, 389). Further, Petersen identifies Isho’ bar ‘Ali as the ophthalmologist (+ 1001) — cf. 53 — but at the same time he elsewhere — 138 — dates him earlier (fl. 890). This would imply that this scholar was of a considerable age when he died. The first date is due to a mistake made by A. Baumstark (cf. A. J. B. Higgins, *IThSt* 45 [1944] 187-199, esp. 199, n. 1); the second is correct. The numbers and dates of Ms. E. differ, cf. 136 (Ms. 202, 1795), 448 (Ms. 67, 1976). The same is true for the date of Sbath 1020, 136: 1797; 449: 1791 (Graf: 1791/2, Metzger: 1797/98, Kahle: 1798).

Sbath himself dates it 1512 a. Mart., which would suggest ca. 1796 (cf. Ms. O, which is dated 1806, on the basis of the date a. Mart. 1522; one counts from 284 AD). As to the date of the Arabic Ms. B, Petersen follows the traditional attribution to the fourteenth century. There is reason for a later date: cf. the view of Kahle (*The Cairo Geniza* [Oxford ²1959] 300), which some of the Dutch Arabists share, after comparing Qur'an manuscripts of the Ottoman period. But all such remarks are trivia if compared with Petersen's great achievement, the presentation of the most comprehensive companion to Tatian's Diatessaron ever written.

Troskerslaan 27
NL-1185-BV Amstelveen

T. BAARDA

Varia

IRÉNÉE DE LYON, *Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*.

Introduction, traduction et notes par Adelin Rousseau (Sources Chrétiennes 406). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1995. 412 p.
12,5 × 19,5

Le ragioni di questo ritorno delle SC sulla *Dimostrazione* ireneana, dopo la traduzione dall'armeno in lingua francese curata da L.M. Froidevaux nel 1959 (SC 62) e ristampa nel 1971, indicate dal curatore stesso nel suo «Avant-Propos» e cioè: «la pubblicazione, nel 1978, dei frammenti armeni del Galata 54... una lettura più approfondita del testo greco soggiacente alla traduzione armena, e la proposta di una traduzione in lingua latina ricalcata sul testo armeno» (7-8), fanno già di per se stesse l'onore di una collana indispensabile per ogni cultore della letteratura cristiana antica.

La recensione di un'opera «patristica» all'interno di una rivista come *Biblica* richiede invece qualche parola di giustificazione. Ci si può di fatto accostare agli scritti di un Padre della Chiesa come Ireneo con intenti estremamente diversi e l'intento di un biblista potrebbe anche non coincidere del tutto con quello di un patrologo. Tuttavia nella misura in cui il biblista sia disposto, almeno per curiosità, a perdere un po' di tempo nel rivisitare l'uno o l'altro periodo della storia dell'esegesi cristiana, potrebbe non giudicare completamente inutile la lettura di un testo «classico» come quello della *Ostensio apostolicae Praedicationis* del vescovo Ireneo di Lione.

Gli potrebbe tornare per esempio utile allora constatare *de visu*, una volta tanto, quanto fosse importante per Ireneo quella indissolubile unità delle Scritture che, se pure nel caso specifico era dettata soprattutto dagli intenti apologetici antignostici, non perdeva per questo la sua valenza ermeneutica fondamentale. Infatti *spiegare le Scritture con le Scritture*, nella costante ricerca di una contestualizzazione del singolo testo che permetta a quest'ultimo di essere letto sempre all'interno del suo *habitat* naturale, significa rapportarsi col testo nella sua permanente vitalità superando il

rischio, tutt'altro che raro, di ridurlo o a semplice reperto archeologico dell'antichità o, peggio ancora, a cadavere da vivisezionare sul tavolo anatomico dello specialista.

Il curatore ricorda infatti giustamente che «Pour Irenée, la vérité divinement révélée n'est pas un conglomerat disparate, mais un 'corps' unique, un ensemble organiquement structuré, en lequel rien n'est superflu et où chaque vérité s'éclaire de la lumière qu'elle reçoit de tout l'ensemble» (227).

Una prospettiva che dovrebbe restare valida tuttora nonostante la difficoltà ovvia per un non-cristiano ad accettare che quell'unità si possa vedere realizzata sinteticamente nella persona di Gesù di Nazaret in cui Ireneo pretende che abbia compimento la profezia di Isaia 10,22-23, quando scrive: «Et quoniam non secundum multiloquium legis, sed secundum breviter fidem et dilectionis salvari habebant homines, Esaias sic ait ad verbum: 'Verbum compendiosum et brebe in iustitia, quoniam verbum breve faciet Deus in universo mundo'» (200); oppure quando, a proposito del «*nomen Domini*» del quale «aliud non est datum sub caelo in quo salvantur homines, nisi Dei qui est Iesus Christus Filius Dei», stabilisce che: «Hic est liber praeceptorum Dei et legis quae est aeterna: omnes qui adprehendunt eam in vitam, qui autem derelinquunt eam moriuntur» (214-216).

E neppure potrebbe essere del tutto inutile forse riconsiderare anche un'altra delle preoccupazioni ireneane consistente nel riconoscere che *la Scrittura viene ricevuta sempre dalle mani della Chiesa*. Infatti come Ireneo non accetta di isolare nessun libro delle Scritture dall'insieme del patrimonio biblico, così non accetta che esso venga sottratto in alcun modo, o sotto alcun pretesto, dalle mani della Chiesa intesa nell'integrità della sua natura che è insieme visibile e portatrice di una realtà invisibile. *L'habitat* naturale insomma di un testo non può non comportare anche lo spazio vitale in cui le Scritture stesse possono respirare. Uno spazio vitale che se per l'Antico Testamento può essere riconosciuto nell'assemblea d'Israele, per l'insieme delle Scritture cristiane Antico e Nuovo Testamento, non può essere altro che la comunità della Chiesa.

Ireneo va in realtà anche oltre quando, eliminando ogni confine cronologico nella cognizione del tempo, stabilisce il principio che: «apud Deum quod probatum est, et in mente propositum decretum est fieri, iam censetur ut factum et, illud respiciens et videns tempus, Spiritus facit verba in quo adimpletur prophetiae eventus» (178).

Nota peculiare di Ireneo è poi la coscienza della permanenza dell'elezione di Israele, nonostante la novità dell'economia inaugurata dal Nuovo Testamento, anche se permane la convinzione che «et Moyses in Deuteronomio futuras esse dicit gentes in caput et indicto audientem populum in caudam... quoniam illi eum quidem qui est Filius Dei improbant reiecerunt Barrabam autem latronem in homicidio deprehensum eligebant, et aeternum quidem Regem negaverunt, temporalem autem Caesarem regem suum confitebantur» (210).

Così come viene ribadito uno dei punti polemici più duri ereditati da Paolo riguardo alla permanente validità o meno della Legge dal momento che per Ireneo «cum recapitulatus sit Deus in nos Abrahae fidem, non iam debemus retrorsum abire, hoc dico ad priorem legislationem. Recepimus

enim legis Dominum, Filium Dei, et per eam quae est in eum fidem discimus diligere Deum ex toto corde et proximum tamquam nos ipsos... propter quod nec lege opus est nobis paedagogo » (212).

Questo addolcimento della cosiddetta «teologia della sostituzione», assai presente invece in altri esegeti cristiani precedenti o contemporanei come Melitone di Sardi o Giustino martire, rivela una fecondità dell'intenzione unitaria di Ireneo che purtroppo non sarà più avvertita a sufficienza dai Padri cristiani successivi, con conseguenze gravissime, che sboccheranno in conflitti insanabili fra Sinagoga e Chiesa che dureranno per secoli.

L'approccio di Ireneo alle Scritture non si esaurisce ovviamente nelle note appena accennate. Bisognerebbe infatti aggiungere per esempio la profonda convinzione, che «necessarium est dicere quoniam non David est qui loquitur neque alius quidam ex prophetis ipse a semetipso — non enim homo est qui dicit prophetias — sed Spiritus Dei» (156) sull'ispirazione divina delle Scritture; oppure la scontata necessità della chiave ottenuta dalla preghiera nella fede per la comprensione di esse («credens Christo et sapientiam intelligentiamque petens a Deo ad intelligendum ea quae a prophetis dicta sunt» (158); oppure ancora quella particolare 'intelligenza' che comporta la 'ricerca costante di Dio', e l'attuazione dei suoi comandamenti', frutti naturali della fede (cfr. 232-233) dal momento che essa si sperimenta sempre nel reale concretamente verificabile nell'esistenza umana. Ma i punti che abbiamo brevemente richiamati dovrebbero essere sufficienti a far nascere maggiore curiosità se non per il contenuto almeno per il metodo esegetico dei Padri e di Ireneo in particolare.

Piazza S. Gregorio al Celio, 1
I-00184 Roma

Guido Innocenzo GARGANO

Gideon FOERSTER, *Masada V. The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports: Art and Architecture*. Jerusalem, The Israel Exploration Society – The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1995. XXVI-238 p. 17 plates. 25 × 31,5. \$80.00

This magnificent volume, as the opening page XI makes clear, differs from the preceding four in that it had to start from scratch without any materials already prepared by Yadin or his staff. The architecture and its stratigraphy had in fact been published as Volume 3 in 1991 by Ehud Netzer, one of the excavation architects; with whom it had been agreed to defer to Foerster all art-history treatment.

The lucid Introduction of p. XVII-XXVI gives ample guidance for following this book's subdivisions. Attention is limited to Herod's "Western Palace", with one ample exception (13-18; plan fig. 31) from his more arresting (three-tiered) palace at the northern tip of the plateau. Since no trace has so far been found of an earlier Hasmonean building-phase alleged by Josephus, our concern here is solely with Herodian period art and architecture.

This art is related first and foremost to the painted or moulded plaster *in situ* or in fragments which takes up the first 80 of the 240 pages. The basis of discussion can only be the still-normative "Four Styles" identified by A. Mau in 1882 at Pompeii and commonly accepted for Italy and all the Mediterranean. An example of this "Pompeian (Second) Style" as noted in the *Oecus* 465 p.21, with Herodian parallel p.26 disallowing Corbo's "First Style".

Actually, however, unknown to Mau there was a variant of the "First Style" found only in the Eastern Mediterranean, and here called "Masonry Style". It is characterized by its employment of "stucco" as a means of simulating ashlar blocks or other architectural elements. The term "stucco" is set apart in this citation: it is used in its Italian sense of *any* cement-lime plaster; this sense is fully and indeed only justified by American and English dictionaries, though a few readers may be derailed by recalling from their childhood the neighborhood houses called "stucco" in the sense of gravel or other protuberances applied to the plaster.

The above-noted exceptional item from the Northern-Tip palace is in fact Masada's best example of this [First (east of Pompeii)] "Masonry Style", and indeed perhaps the most eye-catching feature of this whole book. It seems at first a pity that in the drawing of p.17 and 20 the hatching for red and black are reversed (as noted on a very small and easily lost or overlooked loose corrigenda insert). But who would use the drawing when one can quickly turn to the resplendent foldout Plate 10, and can see all the vivid natural colors themselves! There also are green and some vaguely yellow, which the errata-slip says are not indicated by hatching on the drawing "because of scale". The brief note of Geveret Porat (224-226) analyzes the pigments used.

Admirable though the color-plates are, we discovered at least two interesting items which would have been better served by an enlarged line-drawing. The evocative "crenellated tower pattern" allegedly visible in Plate 5a is explained on p.35 from several known examples in wall-painting or in textiles. Though even for these "the available reproductions are not very clear", surely an imaginative artist's drawing could have diminished our frustration. Even less recognizable is the picturesque "dog's tooth pattern" which we should find in Plates 7d and 8a. Experts familiar with the parallels described on p.6 possibly need no line-drawing, though even at Pompeii "the poor state of preservation makes it difficult to discern this detail".

A second chapter treats stonework, mostly grabbed for use elsewhere. "The columns consisted of drums and not one of them was a monolith". My arithmetic was unable to count to four (types of capitals, XIX); "Corinthian, Corinthian-Nabataean, or Nabataean and Ionic".

The colorful plates again briefly attract us in the chapter on Pavements, especially mosaic (pl.13-14, though pl.15 is white and pl.17 is painted). The final chapter is on the Buildings. Here the line drawings of p.190 and especially 191 evoke the splendor of the three-tiered northern palace as satisfyingly as one could wish. The bath building of course steers us from architecture into hydraulics (*prae-furnium* as p.198 rather than IX). But with

the circumvallation masonry and the isometric reconstruction of p.310 we are left with a last unforgettable view of the whole of that Masada which Josephus and Yadin — and, in his own way, Foerster — have done so much to make live again for us.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Robert NORTH SJ

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Tutti i libri o i fascicoli che vengono inviati alla Direzione appaiono in questo elenco. Il fatto che vi figurino non implica alcun giudizio su di essi. Recensioni più ampie dei libri verranno fatte secondo il parere del Redattore.

I libri inviati alla Direzione che non sono stati chiesti direttamente per recensione non si restituiscono in nessun caso, anche se non potranno essere recensiti. Tutti i libri insieme con gli estratti di articoli inviati alla Direzione vengono trasmessi all'Editore dell'*Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography* e vi appariranno secondo il giudizio dell'Editore.

I libri vanno inviati alla «Direzione di *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Roma (Italia)».

Anderson, R. Dean, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 18). Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996. 315 p. 15 × 23. Dfl 65,—

Backhaus, Knut – **Untergaßmair, Franz Georg** (Hrsg.), *Schrift und Tradition*. Festschrift für Josef Ernst zum 70. Geburtstag. Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996. VIII-508 p. 17 × 24. DM 98,—

Ball, David Mark, *'I Am' in John's Gospel*. Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications (JSNTSS 124). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 309 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £35.50 – \$52.00.

Bauer, David R. – **Powell, Mark Allan** (eds.), *Treasures New and Old. Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies* (SBL Symposium Series 1). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. XIV-454 p. 15,5 × 23. Cloth: \$49.95; paper: \$34.95

Baumann, Michael – **Klauber, Martin I.** (eds.), *Historians of the Christian Tradition. Their Methodology and Influence on Western Thought*. Nashville, Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1996. VI-631 p. 16 × 23,5

Becker, Jürgen, *Jesus von Nazareth* (de Gruyter Lehrbuch). Berlin–New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1996. XI-460 p. 13,5 × 20,5. DM 38,—

Becker, Jürgen, *Paolo, l'apostolo dei popoli*. Tradotto dal tedesco da Enzo Gatti (Biblioteca biblica 20). Brescia, Queriniana, 1966. 477 p. 16 × 23. Lit. 75.000

Becking, Bob – **Dijkstra, Meindert** (eds.), *On Reading Prophetic Texts. Gender-Specific and Related Studies in Memory of Fokkelien van Dijk-Hemmes* (BINS 18). Leiden, 1996. XIII-295 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 145,00 – \$93.75

Beckman, Gary, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (ed. by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.) (SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 7). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. xx-206 p. 15,5 × 23. Cloth: \$44.95; paper: \$29.95

Belleville, Linda L., *2 Corinthians* (The IVP New Testament Commentary Series). Downers Grove – Leicester, InterVarsity Press, 1996. 357 p. 14,5 × 22. £9.99

Bendor, S., *The Social Structure of Ancient Israel*. The Institution of the Family (Beit 'Ab from the Settlement to the End of the Monarchy) (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 7). Jerusalem, Simor, 1996. 348 p. 14 × 21. \$29.00

Benetti, Santos (a cura di), *La Bibbia tematica. Antico Testamento*. Padova, Edizioni Messaggero, 1996. 493 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 40.000

Berlinerblau, Jacques, *The Vow and the 'Popular Religious Groups' of Ancient Israel*. A Philological and Sociological Inquiry (JSOTSS 210). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 219 p. 16 × 24. £39.00 – \$58.50

Berman, Samuel A., *Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu*. An English Translation of Genesis and Exodus from the Printed Version of Tanhuma-Yelammedenu with an Introduction, Notes, and Indexes. Hoboken, KTAV Publishing House, 1996. xvi-702 p. 16 × 23,5. \$79.50

Biblia sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem XVIII. Iussu Ioannis Pauli PP. II. Cura et studio monachorum abbatiae pontificiae sancti Hieronymi in Urbe ordinis sancti Benedicti edita. *Libri I-II Macchabeorum*. Roma, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1995. xl-266 p. 21 × 31

Bieringer, Reimund (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETL 125). Leuven, University Press – Uitgeverij Peeters, 1996. xxviii-794 p. 16 × 24,2. BF 2.400

Biguzzi, Giancarlo, *I settenari nella struttura dell'Apocalisse*. Analisi, storia della ricerca, interpretazione (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 31). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 411 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 57.000

Biran, Avraham et al. (eds.), *Joseph Aviram Volume* (Eretz-Israel. Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies 25). Jerusalem, The Israel Exploration Society – The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University, 1996. xvi-108*-551 p. 22,5 × 28

Boer, Roland, *Jameson and Jeroboam* (Semeia Studies). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. xvi-367 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$44.95; paper: \$29.95

Boismard, Marie-Émile, *Jésus, un homme de Nazareth*. Raconté par Marc l'évangéliste (Théologies). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 216 p. 14,5 × 23,5.

Bonaccorso, Giorgio, *Celebrare la salvezza*. Lineamenti di Liturgia. Strumenti di Scienze Religiose. Padova, Edizioni Messaggero, 1996. 256 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 23.000

Bons, Eberhard, *Das Buch Hosea* (Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar – Altes Testament 23/1). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 186 p. 13 × 20. DM 39 – ÖS 256 – SFr 33,—

Borse, Udo, *Studien zur Entstehung und Auslegung des Neuen Testaments* (SBANT 21). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966. 312 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 79 – ÖS 585 – SFr 75,—

Bray, Gerald, *Biblical Interpretation Past and Present*. Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press – Apollos, 1996. 608 p. 16 × 24. £24.99

Breck, Jean, *La puissance de la Parole*. Une introduction à l'herméneutique orthodoxe. Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 236 p. 14,5 × 23,5. FF 150

Breck, John, *The Shape of Biblical Language*. Chiasmus in the Scriptures and Beyond. Crestwood, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994. x-387 p. 15 × 22,5

Brenner, Athalya (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to the Hebrew Bible in the New Testament* (The Feminist Companion to the Bible 10). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 384 p. 14 × 21,5. £16.50 – \$24.50

Brodeur, Scott, *The Holy Spirit's Agency in the Resurrection of the Dead*. An Exegetico-Theological Study of 1 Corinthians 15,44b-49 and Romans 8,9-13 (Tesi Gregoriana. Serie Teologia 14). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1996. 300 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 30.000 – \$21.00

Brown, Raymond E., *Jésus dans les quatre évangiles*. Introduction à la christologie du Nouveau Testament (Lire la Bible). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 311 p. 11,8 × 18. FF 130

Brown, William P., *Character in Crisis*. A Fresh Approach to the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, W.B. Eerdmans – Bristol, Alban Books, 1996. xi-179 p. 15,5 × 23. \$17.00 – £10.99

Brunert, Gunild, *Psalms 102 in Kontext des Vierten Psalmenbuches* (SBB 30). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 328 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 79,—

Budd, Philip J., *Leviticus* (The New Century Bible Commentary). Grand Rapids., W.B. Eerdmans, 1996. 395 p. 13,5 × 21,5. \$26.00

Campbell, Douglas A. (ed.), *The Call to Serve*. Biblical and Theological Perspectives on Ministry in Honour of Bishop Penny Jamieson. Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 299 p. 16 × 24. £39.00 – \$58.00

Carbone, Sandro Paolo – **Rizzi, Giovanni**, *Michea*. Lettura ebraica, greca e aramaica (Testi e commenti. La Parola e la sua tradizione). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 237 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 39.000

Cazelles, Henri, *Études d'histoire religieuse et de philologie biblique* (Sources bibliques). Paris, Gabalda, 1996. 325 p. 15,5 × 23. FF 550

Cocagnac, Maurice, *L'énergie de la Parole biblique* (Lire la Bible 109). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 278 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 120

Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe. Introduction par R. Gryson, *Livres VIII-XI*. Texte établi par R. Gryson et V. Somers avec la collaboration de H. Bourgeois et C. Gabriel (Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 30). Freiburg i.B., Verlag Herder, 1996. pp. 877-1259. 16 × 24

Cox, Claude E., *Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 42). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. xxii-472 p. 14,5 × 22,5. \$49.95

Cremascoli, Giuseppe – **Leonardi, Claudio** (a cura di), *La Bibbia nel medioevo* (La Bibbia nella storia 16). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 485 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 62.000

Crow, Loren D., *The Songs of Ascents (Psalms 120-134). Their Place in Israelite History and Religion* (SBL Dissertation Series 148). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. XIII-226 p. 14 × 21,5

Dalla Vecchia, Flavio – Nepi, Antonio – Corti, Gianluigi (a cura di), *Introduzione generale allo studio della Bibbia*. Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1996. 835 p. Lit. 110.000

Davies, Philip R., *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Studies in the History of Judaism 134). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. 187 p. 16 × 23,5. \$74,95

de Boer, M. C., *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 17). 360 p. 15 × 23. Dfl 69,90

de Pury, Albert – Römer, Thomas – Macchi, Jean-Daniel (éds.), *Israël construit son histoire. L'historiographie deutéronomiste à la lumière des recherches récentes* (Le Monde de la Bible 34). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1996. 535 p. 15 × 22,5. SFr 220,—

Diebold-Scheuermann, Carola, *Jesus vor Pilatus. Eine exegetische Untersuchung zum Verhör Jesu durch Pilatus (Joh 18,28–19,16a)* (Stuttgart Biblische Beiträge 32). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 334 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 89 – ÖS 650 – SFr 85,—

Dietrich, Walter – Schwantes, Milton (Hrsg.), *Der Tag wird kommen. Ein interkontextuelles Gespräch über das Buch des Propheten Zefanja* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 170). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 173 p. 13,5 × 20,7. DM 43,80 – ÖS 320 – SFr 42,—

Dohmen, Christoph – Stemberger, Günter, *Hermeneutik der Jüdischen Bibel und des Alten Testaments* (Studienbücher Theologie 1,2). Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1996. 216 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 39,80 – SFr 39,80 – ÖS 295,—

Dschulnigg, Peter, *Petrus im Neuen Testament*. Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. xiv-230 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 59 – ÖS 430 – SFr 56,—

Dunn, James D. G., *The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary). Grand Rapids, W.B. Eerdmans, 1996. xviii-388 p. 16 × 24,5. \$32,00

Dutcher-Walls, Patricia, *Narrative Art, Political Rhetoric. The Case of Athaliah and Joash* (JSOTSS 209). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 198 p. 16 × 24. £40,00 – \$60,00

Edelman, Diana Vikander (ed.), *The Triumph of Elohim. From Yahwisms to Judaisms*. Grand Rapids, W.B. Eerdmans, 1996 – Kampen, Kok Pharos, 1995. 262 p. 15,5 × 23. \$25,00

Ferguson, Sinclair, *The Holy Spirit* (Contours of Christian Theology). Nottingham, Inter-Varsity Press, 1996. 288 p. 13,5 × 21. £14,99

Fossum, Jarl E., *The Image of the Invisible God. Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 30). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995. v-181 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 58,—

Frede, Hermann Josef (Hrsg.), *Vetus latina fragmente zum Alten Testament. Die pelagianische epistula ad quandam matronam christianam*

(Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 28). Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1996. 229 p. 16 × 24

Frei, Peter – **Koch, Klaus**, *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich*. Zweite, bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage (OBO 55). Freiburg, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. 337 p. 16 × 23,5. SFr 95 – DM 114 – ÖS 844,—

Fritz, Volmar, *Die Entstehung Israels im 12. und 11. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 2). Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1996. 223 p. 16 × 24. DM 39 – ÖS 289 – SFr 39,—

Fröhlich, Ida, 'Time and Times and Half a Time'. Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 19). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 248 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £39.00 – \$58.50

Garcia Martínez, Florentino – **Trebolle Barrera, Julio**, *Gli uomini di Qumran*. Letteratura, struttura sociale e concezioni religiose. Edizione italiana a cura di Alessandro Catastini (Studi biblici 113). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1996. 374 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 50.000

Garcia Moreno, Antonio, *El Evangelio según San Juan*. Introducción y exégesis. Badajoz-Pamplona, 1996. 524 p. 16 × 24

Gerhardsson, Birger, *The Shema in the New Testament*. Deut 6:4-5 in Significant Passages. Lund, Novapress, 1996. 324 p. 14,5 × 22. £39.00 – \$59.00 – DM 89 – FF 300

Girón Blanc, Luis-Fernando, *Seder 'olam rabbah*. El gran orden del universo. Una cronología Judía (Biblioteca midrásica 18). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 1996. 168 p. 16,3 × 24

Giudici, Maria Pia, «*Lectio divina*» del *Cantico dei Cantici* (Leggere le Scritture 3). Padova, Edizioni Messaggero, 1996. 126 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 13.000

Grégoire de Nysse, *Homélies sur l'Ecclésiaste*. Texte grec de l'édition de P. Alexander. Introduction, traduction, notes et index par Françoise Vinel (Sources chrétiennes 416). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 443 p. 13 × 19,5. FF 298

Grillmeier, Alois, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della chiesa*. II/I: *La ricezione del concilio di Calcedonia (451-518)*. Edizione italiana a cura di Samuele Olivieri (Biblioteca teologica 24). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1996. 475 p. 15,5 × 22,5. Lit. 85.000

Harland, P. J., *The Value of Human Life*. A Study of the Story of the Flood (Genesis 6-9) (VTS 64). Leiden–New York–Köln, E. J. Brill, 1996. xiii-245 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 150 – \$97.00

Hauser, Hermann, *L'Église à l'âge apostolique*. Structure et évolution des ministères (Lectio divina 164). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 150

Herders Grosser Bibel Atlas. Deutsche Ausgabe herausgegeben und bearbeitet von Othmar Keel und Max Küchler. Dritte Auflage. Freiburg–Basel–Wien, Verlag Herder, 1996. 255 p. 27 × 37. DM 49,80

Hess, Richard, *Joshua*. An Introduction and Commentary (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries). Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1996. 320 p. 12,5 × 18,5. £9.99

Hoekveld-Meijer, Gerda, *Esau. Salvation in Disguise*. Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996. xiv-461 p. 16 × 24. Dfl 74,90

Holleman, Joost, *An Index to Vetus Testamentum*. Volumes 1-45 (1951-1995). Leiden–New York–Köln, E.J. Brill, 1996. viii-451 p. 16 × 24. Dfl 150 – \$97.00

Holleman, Joost, *Resurrection and Parousia*. A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 (NTS 84). Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1996. xiv-233 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 135,00 – \$87.00

Hostetter, Edwin C., *Nations Mightier and More Numerous*. The Biblical View of Palestine's Pre-Israelite Peoples (BIBAL Dissertation Series 3). N. Richland Hills, BIBAL Press, 1995. xiv-172 p. 14 × 21,1

Houtman, Cornelis, *Exodus 2*. Chapters 7:14–19:25 (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament). Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996. xi-466 p. 16 × 23,5

Jacobson, Howard, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. With Latin Text and English Translation. Volume One - Volume Two (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 31). Leiden–New York–Köln, E.J. Brill, 1966. xvi-1308 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 432 – \$278.75

Kaltner, John, *The Use of Arabic in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography* (CBQ Monograph Series 28). Washington, The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1996. 122 p. 15,5 × 23. \$7.50

Kee, Howard Clark – **Borowski**, Irvin J., *Removing Anti-Judaism from the Pulpit*. New York, The Continuum Publishing Company, 1996. 140 p. 16 × 23,5. \$19.95

Keller, Martin, *Untersuchungen zur deuteronomischen Nomenstheologie* (BBB 105). Weinheim, Beltz Verlag, 1996. xiii-235 p. 17 × 24,5

Kelly, Brian E., *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (JSOTSS 211). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 279 p. 16,5 × 24. £35.00 – \$50.00

Kiechle, Stefan, *Kreuzesnachfolge*. Eine theologisch-anthropologische Studie zur ignatianischen Spiritualität (Studien zur systematischen und spirituellen Theologie 17). Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1996. xii-446 p. 14 × 22

Kiefer, René, *Jésus raconté*. Théologie et spiritualité des évangiles (Lire la Bible). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 209 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 90

Kinman, Brent, *Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem*. In the Context of Lukan Theology and the Politics of His Day (AGAJU 28). Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1995. xvii-223 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 115,50 – \$75.00

Kissling, Paul J., *Reliable Characters in Primary History*. Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha (JSOTSS 224). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 220 p. 16 × 24. £45.00 – \$65.00

Klauck, Hans-Josef, *Magie und Heidentum in der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 170). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 173 p. 13,5 × 20,7. DM 39,80 – ÖS 291 – SFr 38,—

Koperski, V., *The Knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord*. The High Christology of Philipians 3:7-11 (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 16). Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996. viii-368 p. 15 × 23. Dfl 69,90

Kowalski, Beate, *Die Hirtenrede (Joh 10,1-18) im Kontext des Johannesevangeliums* (SBB 31). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. v-378 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 89,—

Kraus, Wolfgang, *Das Volk Gottes. Zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus* (WUNT 85). Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996. xii-443 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 148,—

Kraybill, J. Nelson, *Imperial Cult and Commerce in John's Apocalypse* (JSNTSS 132). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 262 p. 16 × 24. £33.00 – \$49.00

Kugler, Robert A., *From Patriarch to Priest. The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. x-255 p. 15,5 × 23. Cloth: \$32.95; paper: \$21.95

Lasserre, Guy, *Les synopses: élaboration et usage* (Subsidia biblica 19). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996. viii-134 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 20.000 – \$14.00

Lelièvre, André – Maillot, Aphonse, *Commentaire des Proverbes II. Chapitres 19-31* (Lectio divina – commentaires 4). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 377 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 230

Lemche, Niels Peter, *Die Vorgeschichte Israels. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des 13. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 1). Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1996. 16 × 24. 231 p. DM 39 – ÖS 289 – SFr 39,—

L'Eplattenier, Charles, *L'Évangile de Jean* (La Bible, Porte-Parole). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1996. 423 p. 15 × 21. SFr 42,—

Lind, Millard C., *Ezekiel* (Believers Church Bible Commentary). Scottdale – Waterloo, Herald Press, 1996. 413 p. 13,8 × 22,2. US\$19.95 – Can\$28.50

Loffreda, Stanislao, *Luce e vita nelle antiche lucerne cristiane della Terra Santa* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Museum 13). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1995. 52 p. 17 × 24

Lo Magro, Raffaele, *Paolo di Tarso. I viaggi e la dottrina* (Turrus Babylonia). Milano, Laura Ragoni Editore, 1996. 91 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 20.000

Lozachmeur, Hélène (éd.), *Présence arabe dans le Croissant fertile avant l'Hégire*. Actes de la Table ronde internationale, Paris, 13 novembre 1993 (Recherches sur les civilisations). Paris, Éditions Recherches sur les Civilisations, 1995. 148 p. 16 × 24. FF 155

Maccini, Robert Gordon, *Her Testimony is True. Women as Witnesses according to John* (JSNTSS 125). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 278 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £39.00 – \$58.00

Maier, Johann, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer. Band III: Einführung, Zeitrechnung, Register und Bibliographie* (Uni-Taschenbücher 1916). München–Basel, Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1996. xvi-477 p. 12 × 18,5. DM 49,80

Marcheselli Casale, Cesare (a cura di), *Oltre il racconto. Esegesi ed ermeneutica: alla ricerca del senso* (Biblioteca teologica napoletana). Napoli, M. D'Auria Editore, 1994. 238 p. 16 × 21,5

Martin, François, *Pour une théologie de la lettre*. L'inspiration des Écritures (Cogitatio Fidei 196). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. xii-516 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 190

Martin, Troy W., *By Philosophy and Empty Deceit*. Colossians as Response to a Cynic Critique (JSNTSS 118). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 223 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £30.00 – \$45.00

Matlock, R. Barry, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*. Paul's Interpretation and the Rhetoric of Criticism (JSNTSS 127). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 361 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £43.00 – \$64.00

Matson, David Lertis, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts*. Pattern and Interpretation (JSNTSS 123). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 224 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £43.00 – \$64.00

Matthews, Kenneth A., *Genesis 1-11:26* (The New American Commentary 1A. An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture NIV Text). Peabody, Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1996. 528 p. 16 × 23,5

Mattioli, Anselmo, *Quel no del Giudaismo a Gesù*. I motivi e le cause di un grande fatto storico. Prato, Città Nuova Centro, 1996. 363 p. 18 × 24,5. Lit. 68.000

McGrath, Alister E., *A Passion for Truth*. The Intellectual Coherence of Evangelicalism. Leicester, Apollos – Inter-Varsity Press, 1996. 287 p. 13,5 × 21. £9.99

McLean, B. Hudson, *The Cursed Christ. Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology* (JSNTSS 126). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 263 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £39.00 – \$58.50

McKane, William, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah. Volume II: Commentary on Jeremiah xxvi-lII*. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1996. vii p. + pp. CXXIII-CLXXIV - 659-1396. 14 × 21. £39.95

Melugin, Roy F. – **Sweeney**, Marvin A. (eds.), *New Visions of Isaiah* (JSOTSS 214). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 344 p. 16 × 24. £39.00 – \$58.50

Menken, Maarten J.J., *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*. *Studies in Textual Form* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 15). Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996. 255 p. 15 × 23. Dfl 69,90

Morris, Gerald, *Prophecy, Poetry and Hosea* (JSOTSS 219). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 167 p. 16 × 24. £30.00 – \$45.00

Müller, Mogens, *The First Bible of the Church*. A Plea for the Septuagint (JSOTSS 206 – Copenhagen International Seminar 1). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 16,5 × 24. £25.00 – \$37.50

Murphy, Roland E., *Responses to 101 Questions on the Biblical Torah*. Reflections on the Pentateuch. New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1996. x-126 p. 13,5 × 20,5. \$12.95

Neri, Umberto, *I fondamenti biblici dell'etica cristiana*. Catechesi di Montevoglio 6 (Conversazioni bibliche 10). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 156 p. 11,5 × 18,5. Lit. 18.000

Niemirski, Zbigniew, *Listy Pawłowe oraz List do Hebrajczyków* (wprowadzenie). Radom, "Ave", 1996. 206 p. 14,5 × 20,5

Noegel, Scott B., *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job* (JSOTSS 223). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 223 p. 16 × 24. £30.00 – \$45.00

«*Noi siamo Chiesa*»: Un Appello dal popolo di Dio: «Più democrazia nella Chiesa» (Nostro tempo 54). Torino, Claudiana Editrice, 1996. 239 p. 14,5 × 21. Lit. 28.000

O'Connell, Robert H., *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (VTS 63). Leiden – New York – Köln, E.J. Brill, 1996. xxii-541 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 245 – \$158.50

Origène, *Homélies sur les Nombres*. Tome 1: *Homélies I-X*. Nouvelle édition par Louis Doutreleau (SC 415). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1996. 13 × 19,5. 327 p. FF 191

Page, Hugh Rowland, Jr., *The Myth of Cosmic Rebellion*. A Study of its Reflexes in Ugaritic and Biblical Literature (VTS 65). Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1996. xvi-232 p. 16,4 × 24,5. Dfl 140,00 – \$90.50

Parker, Andrew, *Painfully Clear*. The Parables of Jesus (The Biblical Seminar 37). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 166 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £10.50 – \$14.95

Penner, Todd C., *The Epistle of James and Eschatology*. Re-reading an Ancient Christian Letter (JSNTSS 121). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 331 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £53.00 – \$80.00

Person, Raymond F., *In Conversation with Jonah*. Conversation Analysis, Literary Criticism, and the Book of Jonah (JSOTSS 220). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 204 p. 16 × 24. £30.00 – \$45.00

Piñero, Antonio, *L'altro Gesù*. Vita di Gesù secondo i vangeli apocrifi. (Teologia viva 24). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1996. 196 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 26.000

Prete, Benedetto, *La passione e la morte di Gesù nel racconto di Luca*. Vol. 1: *I racconti della passione. L'arresto* (Studi biblici 112). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1996. 244 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 32.000

Qimron, Elisha, *The Temple Scroll*. A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions. Bibliography by Florentino **García Martínez** (Judean Desert Studies). Beer Sheva, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press – Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society, 1996. vii-124 p. 24 × 31. \$24.00

Revell, E. John, *The Designation of the Individual*. Expressive Usage in Biblical Narrative (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 14). Kampen, Kok Pharos, 1996. 432 p. 15 × 23. Dfl 74,90

Riches, John, *Matthew* (New Testament Guides). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 112 p. 14 × 21,5. £6.95 – \$9.95

Rottzoll, Dirk U., *Studien zur Redaktion und Komposition des Amosbuch* (BZAW 243). Berlin–New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1996. x-319 p. 16,5 × 23,5. DM 168,—

Ruckstuhl, Eugen, *Jesus, Freund und Anwalt der Frauen*. Frauenpräsenz und Frauenabwesenheit in der Geschichte Jesu. Mit einem Beitrag von Walter Kirchschräger. Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 208 p. 21 × 15. DM 79 – ÖS 577 – SFr 75,—

Sacchi, Alessandro, et al., *Lettere paoline e altre lettere* (Logos – corpi di studi biblici 6). Leumann, Editrice ElleDiCi, 1996. 631 p. 17,5 × 24,5. Lit. 60.000

Sanders, Paul, *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32* (OTS 37). Leiden – New York – Köln, E.J. Brill, 1996. x-468 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 258 – \$166.50

Schnelle, Udo, *The Human Condition. Anthropology in the Teachings of Jesus, Paul, and John*. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1996. ix-173 p. 14 × 21,5. £12.50

Schuster, Ildefonso, *Gesù Cristo nella storia*. Lezioni di storia ecclesiastica. Roma, Benedictina editrice, 1996. 121 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 22.000

Seebass, Horst, *Genesis I. Die Urgeschichte (1,1–11,26)*. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1966. VIII-292 p. 14,5 × 22. DM 78 – ÖS 569 – SFr 71,00

Segovia, Ferdinando F. (ed.), “*What is John?*” Readers and the Readings of the Fourth Gospel (SBL Symposium Series 3). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. XII-293 p. 15,5 × 23. Cloth: \$49.95; paper: \$29.95

Seifert, Brigitte, *Metaphorische Reden von Gott im Hoseabuch* (FRLANT 166). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. 285 p. 16 × 23,5

Senior, Donald, *What Are They Saying About Matthew?* A Revised and Expanded Edition. New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1996. 136 p. 13,5 × 20,5. \$9.95

Sherwood, Yvonne, *The Prostitute and the Prophet*. Hosea's Marriage in Literary-Theoretical Perspective (JSOTSS 212; Gender, Culture, Theory 2). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 357 p. 16,5 × 24. £43.00 – \$64.00

Söding, Thomas (Hrsg.), *Der lebendige Gott*. Studien zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Festschrift für Wilhelm Thüsing zum 75. Geburtstag (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 31). Münster, Aschendorff Verlag, 1996. VIII-447 p. 16 × 24. DM 98,—

Spolski, Ellen (ed.), *The Judgment of Susanna*. Authority and Witness (SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 11). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996. 145 p. 15,5 × 23. \$34.95

Stratton, Beverly J., *Out of Eden*. Reading, Rhetoric, and Ideology in Genesis 2-3 (JSOTSS 208). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1995. 292 p. 16,5 × 24. £50.00 – \$75.00

Strelan, Rick, *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus* (BZNW 80). Berlin–New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1996. XXII-380 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 168 – ÖS 1.311 – SFr 161,—

Struppe, Ursula, *Die Bücher Obadja, Jona* (Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar – Altes Testament 24/1). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 155 p. 13 × 20. DM 36 – ÖS 263 – SFr 34,—

Sugirtharajah, R.S. (ed.), *Voices from the Margin*. Interpreting the Bible in the Third World. New Edition. Maryknoll, Orbis Books – London, SPCK, 1995. IX-483 p. 14 × 21,5. \$21.00

Sweeney, Marvin A., *Isaiah 1-39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL 16). Grand Rapids, MI, W.B. Eerdmans, 1996. XX-547 p. 15,5 × 23. \$45.00 – £32.99

Taylor, Justin, *Les Actes des deux Apôtres*. VI. *Commentaire historique* (Act. 18,23-28,31) (EB 30). Paris, J. Gabalda, 1996. XVIII-294 p. 16 × 24

Telford, W.R., *Mark* (New Testament Guides). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1995. 162 p. 14 × 21,5. £6.95 – \$9.95

Theissen, Gerd, *Histoire sociale du christianisme primitif*. Jésus – Paul – Jean. Recueil d'articles traduits par Ira Jalliet et Anne-Lise Fink (Le Monde de la Bible 33). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1996. 294 p. 15 × 22,5. SFr 48,—

Tigheelaar, Eibert J. C., *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End*. Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic (OTS 35). Leiden – New York – Köln, E. J. Brill, 1996. 278 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 147 – \$95.50

Tuckett, Christopher M., *Luke* (New Testament Guides). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 122 p. 14 × 21,5. £6.95 – \$9.95

Utzschneider, Helmut, *Gottes langer Atem*. Die Exoduserzählung (Ex 1-14) in ästhetischer und historischer Sicht (SBB 166). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 134 p. 13,5 × 21. DM 39,80 – ÖS 295 – SFr 38,—

VanderKam, James C., *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament). Columbia, South Carolina University Press, 1995. ix-207 p. 16 × 23,5. \$34.95

Van Tilborg, Sjeff, *Reading John in Ephesus* (NTS 83). Leiden – New York – Köln, E. J. Brill, 1996. vii-232 p. 16,5 × 24,5. Dfl 132 – \$85.25

Veijola, Timo, *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querverbindungen* (Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft 62). Helsinki, Finnische Exegetische Gesellschaft – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996. 296 p. 17,5 × 25

Vervenne, Marc (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Exodus* (BETL 126). Leuven, University Press – Uitgeverij Peeters, 1996. xii-659 p. 16 × 24,2. BF 2.400

Vögtle, Anton, *Gott und seine Gäste*. Das Schicksal des Gleichnisses Jesu vom großen Gastmahl (Lukas 14,16b-24; Matthäus 22,2-14) (Biblich-theologische Studien 29). Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1996. 94 p. 12,5 × 20,5. DM 19,80 – ÖS 147 – SFr 19,80

Wagner, Siegfried, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament* (BZAW 240). Berlin–New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1996. viii-294 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 174 – ÖS 1.288 – SFr 167,—

Wansick, Craig S., *Chained in Christ*. The Experience and Rhetoric of Paul's Imprisonments (JSNTSS 130). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1996. 239 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £35.50 – \$52.00

Webb, Barry, *The Message of Isaiah*. On eagles' wings (The Bible Speaks Today). Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1996. 252 p. 13,5 × 21. £9.99

Wehr, Lothar, *Petrus und Paulus – Kontrahenten und Partner*. Die Beiden Apostel im Spiegel des Neuen Testaments, der Apostolischen Väter und früher Zeugnisse ihrer Verehrung (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen Neue Folge 30). Münster, Aschendorff Verlag, 1996. viii-416 p. 16 × 24. DM 145 – ÖS 1.059 – SFr 129,—

Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 11/2. *Sirach* (*Ecclesiasticus*). 6. Lieferung: Sir 11,35–16,21. Hrsg. Walter Thiele. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1996. pp. 401-480. 24 × 32

Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12 (Pars II). *Isaias*. Fascicule 6. Is 50,4–53,3. Ed. Roger Gryson. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1996. pp. 1201-1280. 24 × 32

Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 12 (Pars II). *Esaias*. Fascicule 7. Is 53,3–54,17. Ed. Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1996. pp. 1281-1360. 24 × 32

Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 22. *Epistula ad Corinthios I.* 2. Lieferung: Einleitung (Fortsetzung). Hrsg. Uwe von **Fröhlich**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 1996. pp. 81-160. 24 × 32

Willi, Thomas, *Juda – Jehud – Israel* (FAT 12). Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995. ix-209 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 168,—

Willmes, Bernd, *Freude über die Vergebung der Sünden*. Synchrone und diachrone Analyse von Psalm 32 (Fuldaer Hochschulschriften 28). Frankfurt, Verlag Josef Knecht, 1996. 108 p. 15 × 21

Wright, Christopher J.H., *Walking in the Ways of the Lord*. The Ethical Authority of the Old Testament. Leicester, Apollos – InterVarsity Press, 1995. 319 p. 13,5 × 21. \$19.99

Würthwein, Ernst, *The Text of the Old Testament*. An Introduction to the *Biblica Hebraica*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids, W.B. Eerdmans, 1995. xiv-293 p. 16 × 23,5. £15.99

Wysny, Andreas, *Die Erzählungen von Bel und dem Drachen*. Untersuchungen zu Dan 14 (SBB 33). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996. 366 p. 14,5 × 20,5. DM 89 – ÖS 650 – SFr 85,—

Young, Brad H., *Jesus the Jewish Theologian*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 1995. xxxvi-308 p. 14 × 21,5

Zañartu Undurraga, Sergio, *Historia del dogma de la encarnación desde el siglo V al VII*. (Textos universitarios). Santiago de Chile, Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile, 1994. 148 p. 18,5 × 25,5.

Zenger, Erich, u.a., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Studienbücher Theologie). Stuttgart–Berlin–Köln, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1995. 447 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 39,80 – ÖS 311 – SFr 39,80

Zink, Jörg, *Die Sieben Zeichen*. Die Wunder im Johannesevangelium als Zeichen zum Heilwerden (Spektrum 4407). Freiburg – Basel – Wien, Herder, 1995. 159 p. 12 × 19. DM 14,80 – ÖS 110 – SFr 14,80

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

Finito di stampare il 14 marzo 1997
 Tipografia Poliglotta della Pontificia Università Gregoriana
 Piazza della Pilotta, 4 – 00187 Roma